THE NEW-CHURCH REVIEW

A QUARTERLY JOURNAL OF THE CHRISTIAN THOUGHT AND LIFE SET FORTH FROM THE SCRIPTURES BY EMANUEL SWEDENBORG

VOL. XLI, No. 1 JANUARY, 1934

HOLBROOK LIBRARY PACIFIC SCHOOL OF RELIGION

Sex: and Some of Its Problems
JOHN PRESTON SUTHERLAND, M. D., Sc. D. 1

Swedenborg's Use of Scripture for Doctrine (III)
WILLIAM FREDERICK WUNSCH 16

The Incarnation OTHMAR TOBISCH 28

Swedenborg Among the Philosophers. [A Review of Swedenborg's "Philosopher's Note Book."]
LEWIS FIELD HITE 34

Daily Reading for Spiritual Sustenance. [A Review of "All the Year Round."] B. A. WHITTEMORE 60

"Rebirth and Glorification." [A Review of a book by Eldred Edward Iungerich.] B. A. WHITTEMORE 63

Pacific School of Religion Berkeley, Calif.

11
34

THE NEW-CHURCH REVIEW

THE NEW-CHURCH REVIEW first appeared in January, 1894, succeeding the monthly *New Jerusalem Magazine* (established in 1827). The quarterly form is adapted to more elaborate articles and fuller discussion of current literature and current events. The REVIEW aims to serve as an international organ of the best thought, progressive and constructive as well as retrospective and critical, of the New Church.

The Board of Editors consists of the Rev. Lewis F. Hite as managing editor, the Rev. William F. Wunsch (in charge of "Studies") and Mr. B. A. Whittemore (in charge of "Current Literature"); with the Rev. H. Clinton Hay in an advisory capacity.

Published by THE MASS. NEW-CHURCH UNION

134 BOWDOIN STREET, BOSTON.

50 CENTS A COPY ALBERT P. CARTER, Treas. $2.00 A YEAR

(Postage to Canada 8 Cents, and to Europe 16 Cents Extra, Per Annum.)

Entered at the Post-Office at Boston as Second Class Matter (Printed in U.S.A.)

OFFICERS OF THE GENERAL CONVENTION OF THE NEW JERUSALEM.—

President, Rev. Fred Sidney Mayer, 3812 Barrington Road, Baltimore, Md.; *Vice-President*, Mr. Ezra Hyde Alden, 1419 Broad Street Station Building, Philadelphia, Pa.; *Secretary*, Mr. B. A. Whittemore, 134 Bowdoin Street, Boston 9, Mass.; *Treasurer*, Mr. Albert P. Carter, 511 Barristers Hall, Boston, Mass.

THE
NEW-CHURCH REVIEW

VOL. XLI] JANUARY, 1934 [No. 1

SEX: AND SOME OF ITS PROBLEMS*

BY JOHN PRESTON SUTHERLAND, M.D., SC.D.

IT is frequently a very difficult task to formulate a definition. Material things are more easily defined (or described) than emotions, sensations, or psychic phenomena. Life, for instance, is not easily defined; neither is love. In regard to the latter it may be claimed there are so many kinds of love it is impossible to fit any one definition to all varieties. There is parental love, which perhaps is the least selfish of any. There is the love of children for parents; the love of brothers and sisters for each other; the love of home, of church, of country; there is the love of one's occupation, of teaching or of learning things; there is the love of pleasure, of money, of gain, of indulgence of self; the love of doing good; the love of nature, of plants, trees, flowers; of the mountains and of the boundless sea; of the beautiful in color and in art. Love in many instances is an emotion, temporary or permanent as the case may be. But different from all of these is the love of man for woman, or vice versa. There is no more impelling love than that of sex. One need not be a follower of Freud to

*Abstract of an essay read by Dr. Sutherland at the December 13, 1933, meeting of the New-Church Club of Boston.

Pacific School of Religion Berkeley, Calif.

48581
v. 41
1934

recognize this fact. Instinctive in all forms of animal life it is instinctive also in man,—because he is from the physical standpoint an animal; the climax of creation, it is true, but an animal, nevertheless, with all the qualities and characteristics of the animal creation. For this sex-love, therefore, doth a man leave father and mother, and cleave unto his wife (Genesis II).

Human sex-love in its best sense, may be defined as a longing for close, intimate, sympathetic, unselfish friendship and companionship between two persons of opposite sex. It implies full reciprocal confidence, complete trust, a desire to serve, to make happy, to protect from physical and spiritual danger and trouble; to be united in the essentials of life; to participate mutually in its joys and delights, as well as in its responsibilities, its griefs and its sorrows; to strive together for regeneration and spiritual development, and to grow into the full stature of a Man, an image of God.

Possibly, however, with the majority of mankind, sex-love is merely and even grossly sensual, and of temporary duration; and as a result, marital maladjustment with some of its many sequelæ. It is a rare occurrence for intentional procreation to be a motive influence in sex life. The majority of children are begotten, as it were, accidentally, not intentionally. Can one help querying what influence this unintentional procreation must have on human beings? Can it be a good thing, for the betterment of the human race or family?

In the animal kingdom, reproductive acts, the result of sex-love, lead definitely and almost without fail to procreation. Under certain influences and definite circumstances, such as periodicity and seasons of the year, the female fish will deposit its spawn, and the male apparently indifferently will pass by and fertilize the spawn. The bird, at certain seasons of the year only, meets its mate; and in response to monogamous sex-love, reproduction occurs, feeding, training and care are given the progeny, and the annual mating and breeding are carried on indefinitely.

The mammalia would seem to be more polygamous than are birds, which again, furnishes food for serious thought, though the breeding habits of wild animals are not as well known as are those of the domesticated, such as mice, rats, guinea-pigs, rabbits, cats, dogs, horses, cattle, sheep, pigs. Here sexual congress is always followed by reproduction. While the male seems strongly polygamous, the female, if equally polygamous, is only periodically influenced by any sex urge; i.e., the male is always aggressive, but the female is "aggressively receptive" only at definite periods. Among many mammals living in a state of nature, sex periodicity is very marked, both males and females being affected thereby. This periodicity is indicative of fertility; and it is at this season only that any approaches by the male are accepted by the female. Monogamy is very common among mammals in a wild state. Periodicity and monogamy are matters humanity might profitably study.

Man is the only living creature that deliberately perverts, or is indifferent to, nature's laws in respect to reproduction. Through lack of self-control, through selfishness, and through ignorance of the law of periodicity; through indifference to the desires of his mate, and wholly thoughtless as to offspring, mankind enslaved by sex-urge continues to follow the habits of generation upon generation, and reaps a reward in undesigned progeny, increased burdensome economic and sociologic problems, ill-health, and disease. From lack of knowledge which is available, and by following impulse instead of reason, man's progress toward the manhood he primarily was intended for has been unspeakably retarded.

As far back as approximately 1890, a very valuable contribution to our biological knowledge was made in the publication of a treatise on the "Evolution of Sex" by Professor Patrick Geddes and J. Arthur Thomson of Edinburgh. This book is purely and wholly scientific in character. It deals chiefly with facts well supported by analytical observation. Theories find small place in its pages, and no

hygienic, moral or religious lessons are connected with any of its chapters.

These authors begin their study with the ultimate unit of life, the single cell and unicellular structures, such as the micro-organisms, germs and leucocytes which reproduce by the asexual method. The authors then consider multicellular organisms of the simpler sort, in which there are vague differentiations of cells and the formation of special areas which represent male and female organs in the one organism. The next step is to the unmistakable presence of reproductive structures, as in the stamen and pistil of plants. Certain forms of hermaphroditic life are treated of; and finally the stage of complete differentiation and separation of sex organs found in the highest forms of life is reached. The book is an acknowledged authority on this subject, and is comprehensive and thorough. It also should never be overlooked that sex, or the dual nature of things, exists in all forms of life in the animal and in the vegetable kingdoms, and even in the inorganic kingdom. It is familiar knowledge in chemistry, that acids and bases have marked affinities, and that the union of the two, an acid and a base, is necessary to make a salt. And it seems a well established fact that protons and electrons are needed to make the ultimate units (or atoms) of matter.

It is in such thorough and comprehensive manner that this vitally important subject of sex should be studied,—from the physical or natural plane up to the spiritual.

Connected with the subject under consideration is a much advertised book, made notorious by having had its sale legally prohibited in this country for several years. This book is by Dr. Marie C. Stopes of London, England, and is entitled "Married Love." Without due and intelligent examination, its entrance into and sale in this country was not permitted until in 1931, Federal Judge John M. Woolsey decided that the book was in no sense obscene or impure, that it did not teach or approve of immorality, and that from the moral standpoint it might legitimately be put

on sale. Judge Woolsey's opinion contains the following sentences:

> I cannot imagine a normal mind to which this book would seem to be obscene or immoral within the proper definition of those words, or whose sex impulses would be stirred by reading it. . . . The book before me here has as its whole thesis the strengthening of the centripetal forces in marriage; and instead of being inhospitably received, it should, I think, be welcomed within our borders.

It belongs in the category of the anatomical and physiological, and deals with facts, conditions, and experiences which heretofore have not been considered even in medical schools. The subject treated of, however, has to do with the life, happiness, and health of humanity; and these things are not by any means confined to the medical school. Human beings get married, and the married life is unique in its anatomical, physiological, and psychological possibilities; and the conditions of married life are such that education, rationality, and knowledge are of much greater vital consequence than in any other of life's relationships. Most unfortunately, the majority of people enter into marriage without any adequate knowledge of sex, or of its essential meaning and its profound significance. Thorough acquaintance with the teachings of this book, would not only enlighten the reader, but would do much to prevent the disillusions, the dangers, the mistakes, the unhappinesses, the sufferings, and the failures of married life. Estrangements, separations, and divorces would be far less numerous, if the facts discussed by Dr. Stopes were matters of general knowledge; and happiness, joy, comfort, bliss, and usefulness would be proportionately increased. True the book has to do chiefly with the physical plane of life, but this is the plane the large majority of human beings live on.

It is quite true that if humanity lived the spiritual life, if mankind realized that we live and grow from within outward, if it were generally acknowledged that things natural and physical as *effects* have one and all their origin in spiritual *causes,*—and if humanity humbly obeyed the commandments, written and unwritten, the material life

would be on a much higher level than is now the case, and disorderly results would, therefore, no longer exist.

No discussion of our subject can be looked upon as even approximately complete that fails to refer to eugenics and to the work and aims of the American Eugenics Society, Inc. This active and influential society of approximately one thousand members was founded in New York City, in September, 1921. During its brief existence it has published a long list of scientific and popular essays, and has done much scientific research work. It has also carried on an effective propagandistic and educative campaign. Pamphlets, magazines, essays, reprints and literature generally setting forth the aims, methods and accomplishments of the society may be obtained by applying to the American Eugenics Society, Inc., 185 Church Street, New Haven, Connecticut. No one not acquainted with the activities of this society should attempt any criticism of its work, or even form any opinion of eugenics or the eugenics movement.

Very briefly put, among the "major proposals" of the American Eugenics Society are:

The improvement of the human race by the dissemination of popular education concerning the established facts of eugenics, by means of courses in schools, colleges and universities;—and popular education through the press.

The encouragement of parenthood among the physically and mentally fit.

The prevention of procreation by hereditary defectives by means of eugenical sterilization.

The fostering of eugenical marriage laws, demanding a certificate of freedom from hereditary defects and infectious venereal diseases as a prerequisite to the issuance of a marriage license.

And the diffusion of contraceptive information by authorized physicians through public clinics, etc., so that the masses may be possibly less fertile or propagative.

To conserve and preserve woman's health so that she can bring virile, strong, and healthy children into this life; to increase the safety of child-bearing; to decrease or remove

its dangers, and ensure subsequent complete recovery to the mother; to secure for the mother the natural and wonderful ability adequately to nurse her offspring, so that her children may in turn be ideally and naturally healthy and vigorous, and free from disease tendencies; to prevent by wholly legitimate measures the birth of diseased, of physically or mentally deficient, of epileptic, of criminally inclined, or of generally unsound and unfit children into the world;—all these things looking to the benefit and improvement of the human race, must be considered as objects worthy of the best and most intelligent endeavors of the wisest human beings.

The question "Who and what is man that he should presume to decide whether or not an immortal soul shall be born into this life?" is too momentous for any attempt here to discuss. It is apropos, however, to claim that, if man would live the kind of physical, moral, and spiritual life it is clearly his duty to live, there would be absolutely no need for the existence of eugenics societies, or for the discussion of these and similar topics.

Normally the female furnishes the embryo with a protective environment and with nutriment for its growth. The inherited tendencies which abide in the ovum are stimulated by the male reproductive elements into the marvelous cycle of changes resulting in growth into a human body in accordance with the laws which govern the development and birth of offspring in all the higher forms of life.

"Where does the soul, the immortal part of man, come from?" "When does God breathe into man's nostrils the breath of life, and man become an immortal soul?" These questions await an answer.

The origin of the soul, the immortal part of man,—in fact, the individual man himself, male or female,—has been one of the great problems of mankind from the days of the early Greeks and even before. Volumes have been written on the subject without reaching a positive, wholly convincing, conclusion. Nothing simpler, nothing so direct,

nothing so satisfying has ever been formulated as the brief statement to be found in Genesis 2:7,—"And God breathed into his nostrils the breath of life; and man became a living soul,"—therefore imperishable, eternal.

One of the most unique, and at first sight astonishing, statements in this connection, is that made by that extraordinary individual, Swedenborg. It should be well understood that Swedenborg had a phenomenally comprehensive and most complete and thorough acquaintance and familiarity with the natural sciences of his day (anatomy, physics, chemistry, etc.), and was not excelled by any individual. But in his day (1688-1772) embryology was in its earliest infancy, and histology was practically unknown. Even anatomy was only emerging from the crude state as taught by Galen in the second century. Swedenborg claims that the soul or spirit is from the father, and that the body is derived from the mother. For instance, we read:

> Every one's soul is from the father, and from the mother it is merely clothed with a body. (Divine Providence, n. 271.)
>
> The soul of the offspring is from the father, and in the womb it clothes itself with the body from the substance of the mother; analogically as seed in the earth, and from the substance of the earth. (Canons, II:9.)
>
> After death every man lays aside the natural which he took from the mother, and retains the spiritual which is from the father. (True Christian Religion, n. 103.)

A few recognized facts are here in order. In common with all other mammalia, all human individuals originate in an impregnated or fertilized ovum; and therefore in their beginning all males and all females, human and sub-human, are as it were a blending of both male and female. Because each fertilized ovum is partly male and partly female, therefore from the standpoint of heredity the mother is as influential as is the father. Modern laboratory experiments are illuminating and convincing on this point. It is well known to anatomists that there are vestigial structures in the male which when suitably developed are characteristic of the female; and *vice versa*.

The beginning of individual life, or the beginning of a human being, is at that period when a male sex element and a female sex element unite to form what is known as an oösperm. To give a little preparatory detail,—it may be said that the ovum (which is a relatively large cell approximately one-one hundredth of an inch in diameter), shortly before or after its escape from its Graafian follicle in the ovary, undergoes certain preliminary changes whereby its nucleus is reduced in bulk. If fertilization does not occur, the life cycle of that ovum comes to an end. If fertilization occurs, it comes about through blending with the male element. The stimulating male element, called a spermatozoön, is a product of cell division and metamorphosis in the tubules of the testes. It is exceedingly small compared with the ovum. It consists of a more or less cone shaped head which forms the chief portion, a neck and a long slender tail many times longer than its head, by means of the fish-like motion of which it moves and is propelled about either until it ceases to exist (an average of eight days) or until it meets an ovum, when the head portion separating from its tail enters the ovum and unites with the waiting and receptive protonucleus. With this union the life of the potential man or woman or other animal begins. Subsequent to this it is simply a question of nutrition, resulting in cell multiplication and cell differentiation; and stage by stage in orderly progression according to law (inherited processes) the male man or the female man is developed and ready for its extra-uterine life.

Once more, after the formation of the oösperm (the fertilized ovum) its chief function is nutrition. The mother simply feeds it,—but upon this feeding practically the whole future of the individual depends. Inadequacy, insufficiency, are the sure results of unbalanced nutrition. But consideration of this matter would lead us too far astray. Thus far we have been dealing with the body, the clothing of the soul which is furnished through nutrition, the nutriment being contained in the mother's blood as the result of her own eating and digesting of food, and transferred to the embryo

through the greater part of its intra-uterine life by means of the placenta. During pregnancy the mother simply feeds her protected embryo or foetus in purely physiological ways. Therefore it can be claimed that she clothes the soul with its body of extra-uterine life. No sign of the presence or the developing of the soul during this all important period of life. Where is it? And whence comes it? Formerly life was supposed to enter the foetus at the period of pregnancy called "quickening." But this idea was given up by scientists and by the intelligencia several generations ago. Evidently this quickening has nothing to do with the soul. In short, at no period of life from its very beginning has there been any evidence that anything so vitally important as the introduction of a soul or spirit into the body has occurred. The life of the human foetus has simply followed the developmental laws and processes common to the mammalia in general; and since all effects are due to specific preceding causes, one must acknowledge that as far as human vision and knowledge are concerned the human body is one with the other mammalia,—except, and this is an enormous exception, insofar as the peculiar conformation of the forebrain is concerned. Here is unquestionably the seat of rationality and of all functions and possibilities connected with it. It is the one thing that distinguishes man anatomically and separates him from the ordinary brute creation, the seat of the soul through which the soul functions.

It is possibly of value to note the fact that the distinctive sex gland, the human ovary, is said to contain at the time of birth, 40,000 undeveloped ova, and that none are formed afterward. Comparatively few of these potential ova ever reach maturity. Whereas the distinctive sex gland of the male man, the testis, forms spermatozoa continuously for many years, by a process of cell growth and cell sub-division. Uncounted thousands of spermatozoa are thus formed during the reproductive period of life. That each spermatozoon should be potentially capable of bringing into existence not only a human body in response to the influence of its animal

soul (*anima bruta*), but in addition an everlasting human soul, seems inconceivable. This would appear to be a most prodigal, a tremendous waste of energy.

That education in sex fundamentals is seriously neglected by parents, and yet is greatly needed by young people, especially by those contemplating marriage, is recognized by all who have ever considered the subject. The Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America, through its Committee on Marriage and the Home, drafted and issued a marriage code for ministers, recommending that clergymen guide couples both before and after marriage by giving pre-marital interviews to couples contemplating marriage, and by the formation of classes or clubs for young married persons. In the statement issued April 9th, 1933 (*Boston Herald,* April 10th, 1933) we find the following sentences:

> Studies in unhappy marriages and the experience of family consultation institutes revealed that ignorance and maladjustment of the sex relationship appear in most cases.
>
> The pastor cannot be certain that those who come to him for marriage understand these vital relationships which God Himself has ordained and sanctified.
>
> If there is inadequate understanding the pastor may render to the new family a service of the greatest importance through the instruction which he gives them.
>
> Whatever is offered while frank and thorough-going should be reverent in tone and in keeping with the seriousness of the occasion.

We have briefly touched upon some of the vital sides of the sex problem, and perhaps have shown that humanity lives almost exclusively on the external, material, or physical plane of life; that *effects* receive greater attention than *causes;* and therefore, that remedial measures are palliative only; and that sometimes the treatment is "worse than the disease," and maybe positively injurious and degenerative. The sole approach to a spiritual consideration of any of the topics here presented (save as contained in Swedenborg's Writings) is found in the inadequate teachings of the Catholic Church. So far as these teachings go, they are

sound and commendable, and need not at this time be discussed.

The resolution adopted April 10th, 1933, at the New England Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church, claims that marriage "also has a spiritual function which is ennobling." This claim, however, forms but a small part of the resolution as a whole.

It is a great help, comfort, and inspiration, to find teachings that go to the root of all these problems with a certainty, an authority, and a rationality that command reverent and submissive consideration. These teachings are to be found in the Writings of Emanuel Swedenborg, especially in his book entitled "Conjugial Love." This book was written by Swedenborg twenty-five years after his "illumination" began; it was first published in Amsterdam in 1768, and it deserves much more than ordinary or passing attention.

The teachings of the New Church in regard to sex and to love truly conjugial, as found in Swedenborg's Writings, may be summarized as follows:

There is a life on earth and a life in heaven.

There is a physical body and a spiritual body in each individual, an external and an internal.

Life in the material body is maintained on earth only; and life as a spirit in a spiritual body is maintained in the future life, or life after death.

Sex or intimations of sex are found in all natural things; for example,—an acid and a base are needed to make a salt; a proton and an electron are needed to make an atom.

Sex in the human family is not only for reproductive or procreative purposes, but also for spiritual purposes.

"Love" as ordinarily conceived or considered in itself is nothing else than a desire, and thence an effort towards conjunction; and conjugial love, spiritual as well as natural conjunction into one; for the male man and female man were so created that from two they may become as one man, and when they become one they are then, taken together, Man (*homo*) in his fullness.

The birth of children is connected with this carnal or mortal life, not with the spiritual.

A male is a male and a female a female after death.

There is a love of the sex of one man for one woman here and hereafter.

During earthly life love of the sex is a love for many and with many of the sex; whereas conjugial love is for one only and with one only of the sex. Moreover, love of many and with many is a natural love, for it is in common with beasts and birds which are natural; but conjugial love is a spiritual love, and peculiar and proper to men, because men were created and are born to become spiritual. Wherefore so far as man becomes spiritual, so far he puts off love of the sex and puts on conjugial love.

Marriages entered into in the world are for the most part external; whereas, it is internal conjunction, or the conjunction of souls, that makes true marriage itself; and this is not perceivable before man puts off the external, and puts on the internal.

There are marriages in heaven; though popular thought holds a contrary view based on misinterpretation of the Lord's answer to the Sadducees: "For in the resurrection they neither marry nor are given in marriage, but are as the angels of God in heaven" (Matthew 22:23-30).

There is one standard of purity of morals for man and for woman here and hereafter.

There is a world-wide difference between love and lust. Lust is degenerative, unchaste, impure, and non-conjugial. Angelic love of the sex is chaste, and wholly free from the allurements of sex. Pruriency, lasciviousness, unchastity, lust, have no place in heavenly life.

They whose love is lust, and who continue in that lust, not only cause to themselves and to others estrangements and miseries in this world life, but carry that lust into the next life, and are ruled by it, and allow it to determine their destiny, which is not heaven. It is quite the contrary with those whose love becomes pure and chaste; for by loving one and one only of the opposite sex in this world

life, their love becomes more and more truly conjugial, and in the next life it becomes increasingly conjugial, with all the delights and benefits and happiness attending heavenly life.

Enough has been said for present purposes contrasting the status of the world and its crude and external treatment of sex and marriage, with the comprehensive and spiritual teachings of the New Church on the same subjects. At all events an effort has been made to show that there is sex in everything; that God created sex and created it for a purpose; that man's perversions have penetrated into the sphere of sex; that sex and marriage are holy things; that sex and marriage have to do with life present and life everlasting.

Therefore it would seem distinctly in order, and much to the point, to remove the sentimental aversion to thinking about and discussing these subjects; to insist on young people's learning in season the blessedness and the holiness of sex and marriage; and to spread abroad at suitable times and in suitable places doctrines that tend to offset many of the popular teachings of the day, and substitute therefor knowledge that is heavenly in its origin.

That the world is being prepared for this innovation is testified to by the statement emphasizing the need of educational preparation of young people for marriage as drafted by the Committee on Marriage and the Home, and officially approved by the Executive Committee of, and presented to, the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America, April 9th, 1933. This statement (referred to on a previous page) entitled "Safeguarding Marriages" has been distributed to clergymen generally, and is published in full in the April 19th issue of *The New-Church Messenger*. Editorial comment also is made on the subject, and from this comment the following quotation is made, as it presents standards which should be widely broadcasted; standards which though high are not inaccessible, and standards which should be approved by all persons irrespective of race, tradition, color, or religion who have the welfare,

health, and happiness of mankind at heart. The editorial says:—

> What is needed is a true yet simple philosophy of marriage that can be taught to people in early youth, and which will provide ideals preventive of hasty attachments resulting from mere propinquity.
>
> In the New-Church doctrine of marriage we have such a philosophy, one which furnishes truths which should be taught to boys and girls as part of their religious education . . . [so that they may] grow up in the knowledge that true marriage love comes from the Lord, that a true marriage is the union of two minds, and that marriage should be the result of providential leading. All our young people should be made familiar with the idea, that if they are living according to the divine law, they will be guided in their choice of a partner. . . .
>
> For every man there is a woman who is his divinely appointed partner. For every woman there is a man who more than all others can make her happy. The confusion and accidents of human life may prevent their union in this life. But we can reasonably expect that when the Lord wills an end, He also provides the means, and that in the great majority of cases, young people have an opportunity of meeting their divinely appointed consorts.
>
> The religious significance of marriage should be taught to the young. The Divine ideal of marriage should be as familiar to them as are the Ten Commandments. The young people would still fall in love. They always have and they always will, but properly educated they would have an immeasurably better opportunity of falling in love with the right person. (A. W.)

JOHN P. SUTHERLAND.

SWEDENBORG'S USE OF SCRIPTURE FOR DOCTRINE (III)

The Heart of His Procedure

By the Rev. William F. Wunsch

WE ARE told in Swedenborg's Theological Works that "doctrine is to be drawn from the sense of the letter of the Word and confirmed thereby" (see the Doctrine of the Sacred Scripture, chapter v). What does this familiar statement mean? Just what is the procedure described and prescribed in it?

We have seen reason to assume* that whatever the procedure is which is meant, it is Swedenborg's own method in employing Scripture for doctrine. He does not say explicitly that it is, but we found that there are reasons for so concluding. He must have pursued the procedure which he prescribes. And in fact a drawing of doctrine in the first instance from Scripture, and then a confirming of it by Scripture, is the procedure which is everywhere apparent or reflected in his doctrinal books.

Swedenborg's earliest statements about the source of doctrine in the Word were broad statements. In the "Arcana Cœlestia" he says only that doctrine is to come from the Word.

> Be it known that all the doctrine of the Church must be from the Word, and that doctrine from any other source than the Word is not doctrine in which there is anything of the Church, still less anything of heaven. (N. 9924 (2).)

*The preceding papers appeared in the issues of this Review for April and July, 1933.

He also continued to make this more general form of statement to the last of his published works. In speaking of his call in "True Christian Religion," he says,

> From the first day of that call I have received nothing at all pertaining to the doctrine of that [the new] Church from any angel, but from the Lord alone as I read the Word. (N. 779e.)

As he settled down, however, to the specifically doctrinal works like the treatises bound together in "Four Leading Doctrines," he began to say much more precisely what the source of doctrine is. Not just from the Word, but from its sense of the letter, is doctrine to come, and indeed to be "drawn." By that sense also it is to be substantiated. Under the term "the sense of the letter" he means what most Bible readers mean by Scripture. He employs the term he does, because to him there is also a deeper sense in Scripture. We shall see that this deeper sense also enters into the formulation of doctrine; but the main description of the doctrinal process on Scripture is steadily that the doctrine is to be drawn from the literal sense of the Word and confirmed thereby. Into this procedure we wish to inquire now. I am not aware that we possess anywhere in our literature an examination of this theological method with Scripture. In fact, the step called "drawing of doctrine from Scripture" seems to me to be overlooked regularly, or underestimated. But in any branch of study, procedure has its own importance. It may possess or it may lack validity. In this vital matter of deriving doctrine from Scripture, method has an obvious importance. A bad procedure will give a bad result; and even if the method is good, but not grasped or followed, the result—here a doctrine—is held blindly, with no perception of how it arises from Scripture.

How far we are from appreciating the force of Swedenborg's statements about the source of doctrine in Scripture, may be gathered from the appearance in one of our periodicals of the assertion:

> From this source, viz., from the writings of Swedenborg, for

there is no other source, we must obtain our doctrine. (*The New Age,* August, 1933, p. 267.)

The writer in "The New Age" has for his one source of doctrine Swedenborg's writings, while those writings declare that the one source is the sense of the letter of the Word. Indeed, the author of that article announces that the purpose of his paper is "to show that in all cases and in every portion of the Word, the sense of the letter *should never be used* for the purpose of learning doctrine" (p. 259; our italics). Yet Swedenborg says that the method of drawing doctrine from the sense of the letter is always in order.

> The doctrine of genuine truth can also be drawn in full from the sense of the letter of the Word. (Sacred Scripture, n. 55.)

The method holds good likewise when it is the doctrine of the New Church which is concerned. Some other source does not then supersede the sense of the letter of the Word. In "Apocalypse Revealed" we are told that "the wall of the New Jerusalem" signifies

> the Word in the sense of the letter, from which is the doctrine of the New Church. (N. 898.)

The paragraph cited is devoted to this particular point, and concludes with the strong statement,

> The doctrine of the New Church, which is signified by "the city," is solely from the sense of the letter of the Word.

Again, at n. 902, we read,

> The Word in the sense of the letter contains all things of the doctrine of the new Church.

We might glance at some of the reasons given by Swedenborg why doctrine should always be drawn from the sense of the letter of the Word and confirmed thereby.

> The Lord does not speak to man except in what is full, and the Word in the sense of the letter is Divine truth in its fulness. (*Ibid.,* n. 97.)
>
> Doctrine must be drawn from the sense of the letter and con-

firmed thereby. The reason is that there and nowhere else is the Lord present with man, and enlightens him and teaches him the truths of the Church. Moreover the Lord never operates anything except in what is full, and the Word is in its fulness in the sense of the letter. This is why doctrine is to be drawn from the sense of the letter. (*Ibid.*, n. 53.)

Still other reasons are indicated here and there in the Theological Works. We have, for example, to depend upon reference of a doctrine to its true source, in order to correct a mistaken teaching (Arcana Cœlestia, n. 9409 (5)). Short of an effort to draw our doctrine from the Word, moreover, we remain in the dogmas in which we have been brought up, whether these are right or wrong (*ibid.*, n. 4368). And the method which Swedenborg prescribes is the one which real love of truth inspires (*ibid.*, n. 4368).

If then the Word in its sense of the letter is the source of doctrine, what is meant by "drawing" the doctrine thence? This first half of the statement under consideration is the half which is unheeded or to which due weight is not usually given. It is left out of the picture of Swedenborg's own procedure with doctrine, until he is thought of as only resorting to Scripture for substantiation of his teaching. But this, a long procession of theologians have done, bringing their doctrine from elsewhere to Scripture, and finding echoes of it in Scripture. This is not treating the Word as the source of doctrine. It is treated as source only when doctrine is originally formulated from the sense of the letter of the Word. There the thought or substance of a doctrine is to be found. We have recited the discriminations with which this must be done. Not all Scripture is available for doctrine, much of it being non-doctrinal. Even in what is doctrinal one must distinguish between apparent truth and genuine truth; genuine truth can be utilized directly in the formulation of doctrine, but not apparent truth, at least not until it has been corrected to the truth underlying it. But our attention is now on the method to be pursued on such Scripture as is available for doctrine. The doctrine is to be formulated in the first instance from this Scripture, not

brought, already formulated, from elsewhere, and merely substantiated by Scripture.

Consider the very term which Swedenborg uses: "draw." The Latin, *"haurio,"* even more decisively than the English word, points to a process, a ransacking of Scripture for the doctrinal material on a given subject, and then the systematic arrangement and statement of the teaching so derived. No less thorough a procedure satisfies the word "draw." Swedenborg speaks of Scriptures *"collecta"* or *"collata"* (as in *De Verbo,* n. 48), or of doctrine "gathered" as well as "formed" (Arcana Cœlestia, n. 9424 (2), Apocalypse Explained, n. 356), and is pointing to the first stage in the process—the assemblage of pertinent Scriptures. Out of the assembled material the doctrine is then "formed" or wrought. Scripture statements are not adopted as they stand. They are not picked up bodily; as, for example, a single statement on divorce habitually is, and treated as the teaching. For, as the Arcana Cœlestia, n. 9032, points out, "the letter itself is not the truths of doctrine." Or again, "the Word in the letter or in the literal sense is not doctrine itself" (n. 9424(2)). A work of explication" (n. 9025) has to be done on the assembled passages, or of systematic extrication of the teaching representative of all the material. "Drawing doctrine," then, is not a simple or single act, but a process; it is an elaboration of the teaching. (Witness the remoteness, sometimes, or "recession" (n. 9025(2)) of the elaborated teaching from any one or more of the statements of Scripture employed.)

One statement or type of statement occurs in the Theological Works which seems to many readers to point us outside the Word for our doctrine. This is the declaration that the Word cannot be understood without doctrine (Sacred Scripture, n. 51) or must be read from doctrine (Arcana Cœlestia, n. 2356). To many readers this sounds as though we must find our doctrine elsewhere, bring it to the Word and read the Word in the light of it. But this statement cannot be interpreted so as to conflict with

Swedenborg's steady position that doctrine is to be drawn from the Word. It cannot be sending us for doctrine elsewhere than to the Word. On reflection it becomes plain, I think, that what the statement means is that unless one is systematizing the teaching of Scripture, or "forming doctrine," as one reads, one will not read intelligently. For what the Word says on a subject, it says a little here and a little there, sometimes in the terms of a deeper insight, sometimes in the terms of an insight not so deep. To read understandingly one must be bringing together what is scattered, that is, must be reading with doctrine. Are we not urged to do precisely this by "Sacred Scripture," n. 51, where Swedenborg points out the need for doctrine, and cites Scriptures which are scattered in the Bible, and which need coordinating? At "Arcana Cœlestia," n. 9424(2), we are told in one breath that doctrine is needed to "support" the Word, and that it must be collected from the Word—it is not to be brought from elsewhere. Again at n. 10324 we read:

> The Word in the letter cannot be apprehended except by means of doctrine *made from the Word* by one enlightened [our italics].

The doctrine which is a lamp for reading is still furnished by the one source of doctrine, the Word: "There must be doctrine from the Word, because without it the Word is not understood" (*ibid.*, n. 10763). "Without doctrine from the Word the Word is not understood" (New Jerusalem and Its Heavenly Doctrine, n. 257). If the sense of the letter is the candlestick, the only pertinent light is doctrine from that sense (Apocalypse Explained, n. 356, especially (1) and (4); Sacred Scripture, pp. 52, 59). (There is such a thing, it is true, as learning our doctrine first from a doctrinal book; we all do; but this is a stage in our own growth, in years when we cannot be more thorough. In our last paper we shall consider this stage in our individual religious development. Here we are discussing the full or mature procedure of theology.)

We have already spoken of what must be the first step in

drawing doctrine from the sense of the letter. All available Scripture concerning a topic has to be assembled. This initial step is an affair of the study and library; it is therefore not much reflected in the Theological Works, which are not preliminary studies, but final presentations. Yet this stage of the process is reflected in the quotations of Scripture in them, and is represented in such a work as "Scripture Confirmations." As has been suggested in *New-Church Life,* 1907, p. 23, "Scripture Confirmations" would more accurately be called "Collected Scriptures." It lists not Bible passages by which Swedenborg was only to confirm his doctrine, but passages from which he was to draw his teaching in the first place. He was to use the collection in writing the "Coronis" (see article cited in *New-Church Life*). Notice, too, that the passages assembled there are gathered from books without a spiritual sense as well as from books with the spiritual sense (which means that Swedenborg is concerned there with theological formulation); and likewise that formulation has proceeded to the point where sources are arranged under doctrinal heads.

The next step in the whole process of drawing doctrine from Scripture is evaluation of the collected material. We have noted Swedenborg's constant discrimination of "apparent truth" and "genuine truth"; this and other evaluations must be made in the assembled material. Words of the Lord's own, as, for example, about His Return, must surpass in value the representations by His followers of what they understood Him to say. "Scripture Confirmations," we find, instead of amassing Scriptures irrespective of where they come from, quotes Gospels and Epistles separately.

The third and last step in the process is of course the active construction and statement of the teaching derived from the Scripture material. When Swedenborg began composition of a doctrinal book, he had already arrived at this stage of the process. Earlier stages in the whole process are to be found in his published books only by implication;

the books represent the final step. He is offering results, not taking us over the course by which he has arrived at the results.

Now, we have some important responsibilities in connection with drawing doctrine from the Word, as I hope we shall see in our concluding paper. The address to Scripture which we have been describing is incumbent on the mature Christian, particularly on the theologian, but on the layman as well. At present, however, we are only trying to describe Swedenborg's procedure, and are urging that this process, with the stages in it which we have noted, alone satisfies the prescription that "doctrine is to be drawn from the sense of the letter of the Word."

Obviously, when a doctrine has actually been drawn from the literal sense of the Word, there is no difficulty in confirming it from that sense. Substantiation of it is easy then and widely possible, and clinches the whole process. What has been derived from the Word can be upheld by it (True Christian Religion, n. 508(5)). Plainly, no impossible doctrine can be foisted on the Word, if this procedure is followed; the workman starts in the Word, and can emerge only with Scriptural teaching. It is only when one has not drawn one's teaching from the Word, that one can confirm by Scripture any dogma whatever. Just as plain is it that if we have not first derived our teaching from the sense of the letter, our mere confirmation of even a true teaching is blind. "Without previous perception of a truth, the light of confirmation is natural light" (New Jerusalem and Its Heavenly Doctrine, n. 35). Confirmation is meaningful and enlightened, just as it is widely possible, only as a second and secondary step, supplementary to the work of drawing a doctrine from the Word.

But what of the spiritual sense in this formulation of doctrine from the Word? Does that sense enter into the procedure? The deeper sense of the Word was supremely real and richly available to Swedenborg; did he bring it into the work of formulating doctrine from the Word?

If so, how? Needless to say, he did utilize the spiritual sense in the work of formulating doctrine. He significantly preceded each cycle of doctrinal work by a period of exposition of the spiritual sense of the Word. Compare also the jottings of spiritual meaning which he introduced into "Scripture Confirmations." In just what way, then, did Swedenborg utilize the spiritual sense in his theological work? He was exceedingly careful to say how he did. It did not serve as a source of doctrine. He never forsook the position that all doctrine is to be drawn from the sense of the letter of the Word. Definitely and decisively he wrote of the spiritual sense that "doctrine is not procured by means of that sense" (Sacred Scripture, n. 56).

> Doctrine can never be seen first from the spiritual sense. The man thinks falsely who says to himself: "I know many correspondences, I can know the true doctrine of the Divine Word, the spiritual sense will teach it to me." This cannot be done. (*De Verbo,* n. 58.)

It is as though Swedenborg were jealous for the objective, plain source which doctrine has in the sense of the letter, as against a hidden sense.

> It is of first importance therefore for a person to study the Word in the sense of the letter; from that alone is doctrine given. (Sacred Scripture, n. 56e.)

How the spiritual sense cannot be utilized is plain enough, then.

Swedenborg is equally explicit on how the spiritual sense does serve in the formulation of doctrine. It "lights up and corroborates a doctrine" (Sacred Scripture, n. 56). When the sense of the letter has proposed and afforded the substance of a doctrine, the deeper sense then plays these definite rôles: it throws light on the teaching, and it contributes corroborating details.

These two functions of the deeper sense of the Word cannot be illustrated better than by the doctrine of the Lord's glorification. The Gospels in their plain sense put forward the idea that the Lord during His life on earth

underwent a profound change in His Divine-human nature, a change to which they refer as His being "glorified." The doctrine of His glorification is to be drawn from these plain Gospel notices. Without such an objective, historical witness for the whole idea, there would be no warrant for any such doctrine. It must be drawn from the literal sense of the Word. But the spiritual sense of the Old Testament stories about the patriarchs, as we all know, tells the detailed story of the Lord's glorification. From it endless details can be imported into the doctrine of glorification, throwing a profound light on the doctrine, once this is fashioned from the letter.

The spiritual sense serves the formulation of doctrine in some other ways, too. It sheds light not only on a doctrine derived from the sense of the letter, but on this sense itself. This light helps one to discern better, for example, which are apparent truths in the literal sense, and which are genuine (see Arcana Cœlestia, n. 6071). The spiritual sense also exerts its influence to withhold one from those misconceptions of the letter of Scripture which are liable to give rise to any dogma at all (*ibid.*, n. 3451(2)); just the effort to formulate the Word's teaching is influential to the same end (*ibid.*, n. 9409(4)), as we have seen. And it must be in the general light shed by the spiritual sense that the Word assumes that deep-lying unity in which contradictions disappear, for these do persist in the sense of the letter (Sacred Scripture, n. 51).

But is not the doctrine of the New Church called the doctrine of the spiritual sense? "The internal sense is very doctrine itself" (Arcana Cœlestia, n. 9409(3)). How shall we understand this, if all doctrine, including that of the New Church, is derived from the sense of the letter of the Word? Can the fact that the spiritual sense fulfils such rôles as we have recited, be sufficient reason for calling a doctrine the doctrine of the spiritual sense? At any rate, we cannot say that a doctrine is so called because it has the spiritual sense for its source. Source of doctrine, the

spiritual sense cannot be (Sacred Scripture, n. 56). Consider, however, that a doctrine can be drawn from the sense of the letter with no recourse to the deeper sense of the Word. So the first Christian era drew its doctrine, and so theology in general does today. Consider that doctrine can also be drawn from the literal sense in the light of the spiritual sense of the Word, with the latter contributing endless fortifying details. Is not doctrine drawn in this second way entitled to be called by contrast a doctrine of the spiritual sense?

A suggestion may be proffered briefly on a related matter. If Swedenborg draws his doctrine from the literal sense of the Word, but also utilizes the spiritual sense for light and detail, it is obvious that he can cite a Scripture in one of two ways. He may quote a Scripture passage because in its literal sense it is source-material, or because in its spiritual sense it offers light and detail for a doctrine. These citations need to be distinguished. Our assumption is likely to be that the Scripture passages are put forward in their literal sense and as source-and-confirmation material for doctrine. That may or may not be the case. Obviously, a passage may be cited for what its spiritual sense gives. Then to treat it as source-and-confirmation Scripture is to make more of it than he did. In so doing, we ask readers to rest a doctrine on it which he did not rest on it, and we invite the objection that the doctrine is ill-based, as it would be on a passage or on passages meant only in their spiritual sense. For example, Swedenborg quotes the Book of Daniel, both on the title-page and in the text of "True Christian Religion," in his discussion of a new Church and of the Lord's Second Coming. It would be a mistake to say that his doctrine on these subjects is *rested* on Daniel, for that would imply that in the literal sense Daniel has to do with these topics, when that is not true. In its spiritual sense, however, it throws light on the subjects, and offers detail for the doctrine on them.

We have now described what we feel is the heart of

Swedenborg's procedure in dealing with Scripture for doctrine. He draws the substance of a teaching from the sense of the letter of the Word. The teaching of Scripture is what he is laboring to set forth. Naturally he can substantiate from Scripture doctrine derived from it, and does so abundantly. He also imports detail from the spiritual sense of the Word into his formulation of doctrine, and always he carries on his doctrinal formulation in the light of the spiritual sense. All this is the core of his method. In our next paper we shall consider some other features of the whole procedure, which distinguish it still further, though they are relatively only aids to this inner body of method.

WILLIAM F. WUNSCH.

THE INCARNATION

By the Rev. Othmar Tobisch

SOME of the most prominent questions involved in such a paramount doctrine of the Church as the Incarnation of God in man have been answered most explicitly in the Writings of Swedenborg.* Some have been elucidated to such an extent as to constitute no longer a question.

The writings of antiquity are not devoid of promises of a Divine-Becoming-Flesh. In Babylonian bas-reliefs, the protective god of the king was always pictured in human form, symbolically designated by a helmet adorned with two horns. In Egypt the kings were thought of as sons of Râ, the sun-god. Descent from the sun-god is also claimed by the Mikado of Japan. About 250 B.C. there appeared in the Laws of Manu (Hinduism) reference to the Brahman as the supreme incarnation of deity.

In the mythology of the Greeks there are numerous stories indicating the belief that the Divine could and would manifest Itself in human form. Similar beliefs were expressed in Far Eastern religions, in Buddhism, in Taoism (if the latter can be called a religion in the strict sense of the word), in Jainism:

> He descended from heaven . . . the Venerable Ascetic Mahavira descended from the great Vimana (palace of the gods). (Hume's "World's Living Religions," under Incarnation.)

The saga of Heracles deserves special reference here, as shown by Rev. A. L. Goerwitz in his paper before the Council of Ministers on June 18th, 1930 (see *New-Church*

*The Writings say remarkably little on the term "incarnation," the Concordance having but fourteen entries in all. References must be found under "advent" (*adventus domini*).

Messenger, July 16, 1930). God as Man was the object of worship by the ancients (see Arcana Cœlestia, nn. 5663, 6846, 9193/3). The Aztecs of Mexico received their white conquerors as gods. Throughout the civilized nations of antiquity there was fostered the idea of the Divine showing Itself to men in a Divine Human.

However, most emphatic—and ethical—is the message in our own Scriptures. In the "Arcana Cœlestia," n. 250, we read:

"And I will put enmity between thee and the woman, and between thy seed and her seed. He shall trample upon thy head, and thou shalt bruise his heel" (Genesis III:15). Every one is aware that this is the first prophecy of the Lord's advent into the world; it appears clearly from the words themselves, and therefore, from them and from the prophets, even the Jews knew that a Messiah was to come.

The knowledge of the Savior was incorporated in the writings of the Ancient Word, of which Genesis III was a part; and from them the so-called magi, or astrologer-priests, derived their information.

They also knew from their prophetic writings, which were of the Ancient Church (n. 2686), that the Lord was to come into the world, and that then a star would appear to them, of which star, moreover, Balaam, who also was one of the sons of the East, prophesied. (Arcana Cœlestia, n. 9293.)

The hope that the Divine would show Itself in human form was acceptable to all who believed in a Divine. And so it is today. There should be no difficulty whatsoever in believing in the orderly, progressive, and meditated method by which the Supreme Divine in all its Power and Wisdom incorporated itself in bone and flesh.

Anyone believing in such a Divine may see the way in which it was done. Only materialists, atheists, agnostics, and nature-worshippers have insurmountable obstacles in themselves to such belief, because their minds are closed to the perception of the Divine and its Power.

The belief in God, and the form of the belief in God, makes or unmakes our acknowledgment of Jesus as the in-

carnation and manifestation of the Father in Heaven, or Jehovah God. If we believe in God as the creator of man and of the human form, it would be utterly inconsistent *not* to believe in His showing Himself as Man Divine to the human race.

In fact, from the first intimation of incarnation (Gen. 3:15) the Divine was preparing this descent of God. Evidence of this may also be found in the genealogy of Jesus in the Gospel of Luke, which traces the ancestry of Jesus's legal father, Joseph, back to Adam and God. The purpose of this genealogy is to establish an unbroken line of descent from the very Man. It does spiritually tell us, that from the time of the "fall of man" the Divine had looked toward a consummation of its desire to show Itself in as complete as possible an unfoldment of its Love-nature.

The perversion of human nature, the supreme regard of self, the worship and cult of the sensual, had called for a counter move by the Lord to save mankind from self destruction. So the Lord "came into the world that He might subdue the hells and reduce all things into order [that is, Divine and celestial order], even the heavens" (Arcana Cœlestia, n. 10,026). The reason that the Lord came at the specific time from which we date our calendar, was that He bided His time until the state of the church was such that there was no longer any good done by it, not even natural good, and there was consequently with the Jews (particularly the rulers among the Jews) no longer any acknowledgment of the truth. This state is what is meant by the "fulness of time" and "the consummation of the age" and "the day of the Lord," so much spoken of by the prophets (*ibid.*, n. 3398).

The gospel of John emphasizes this state of rejection of everything the Lord said: "Many of them said, He is possessed by a demon, and he is mad. Why do you listen to him" (John 10:19).

The Lord's Coming into the world in the fulness of time —to bring new love and new understanding to men—was done so as to bring about most efficiently the incorporation

of Divine Love into Divine Wisdom, and from thence into human life. The incarnation, therefore, rests essentially upon two things: the Going-Forth of the Divine Wisdom (Logos, Word.— John 1), and the preparation of a vessel into which this Word or Wisdom could be poured. So it involved also a human form from a mother on earth, and a direct conception by the Holy Spirit or Word Divine. The Word creates the universe (Gen. I); the Word creates man (Gen. I); the Word creates the Divine Human to be shown to man.

> Fear not Mary, for thou hast found favor before God. Thou shalt conceive in the womb and shalt bear a son and shalt call his name Jesus. . . .
>
> The holy spirit shall come upon thee, and the power of the Highest shall overshadow thee, wherefore, the one being born out of thee, shall be called Holy, Son of God. (Luke I.)

From this is evident that the creative power of God—in the Logos—was the medium of conception in the womb of Mary. As creation is in stages, or in stepping down, it is first through the medium of the Spiritual Sun (see Divine Love and Wisdom, n. 146-167). The descendance and action of the Creative Power of the Divine came through the Sun of Divine Love and Divine Wisdom, which the angels of heaven have always before them. The Holy Spirit is this proceeding of the Divine. Divine Light is through the Holy Spirit. Conception was by it or, what is the same, by Truth Itself.* Fruition was in the maternal body of Mary. Thus was the Divine clothed with a human.

After conception there was a continuous influx of Divine spirit, opening the vessels of the human form from within, gradually unfolding them one by one. First were opened the inmost or *anima;* then the interior vessels of the highest perceptions in man, the intellectual things of the love of God, the power to know Divine truths and to love Divine good. Thence descended the unfolding power into the levels

*"Truth itself which proceeds from the Lord is called the Holy Spirit; and because it is in light, it enlightens" (Divine Love and Wisdom, n. 149).

of highest human wisdom, into the floor of the *"rationalia,"* the functions of our reason, the power-house of our will, the judgment-seat of our choice, the guardian of our ethical nature, conscience. Simultaneously the flesh grew and the babe matured in the normal fashion of human beings. An unusual influence even then emanated from the Savior as yet unseen.

When Elisabeth heard Mary's greetings, her child moved within her, and Elisabeth herself was filled with the Holy Spirit; and she gave a great cry, and said: "You are the most favored among women. And blessed is your child (the fruit of your womb). What am I that the mother of my Lord came to me?" (Luke I.)

Every possible precaution was taken by the Divine Creator that all functions of the ripening should take their due course. The bodily instruments, brain, nerves, sense-organs, grew in proportion as the Divine Soul descended netherwards to come to a conjunction at the moment of birth.

Also, the vessels of selfhood, the sources of evils, were firmly entrenched in the *animus* (the emotional man). Image-receptors, sensories, were made ready to receive the first impacts of a worldly environment. The inheritance of the Jewish race, deeply imbedded in the maternal contribution to the mind of Jesus, was laid up in its own centers. Though this corporeal, sensual, even rational man was contaminated by the endless perversions of Divine Life as practiced by the Jews, the inward life-stream of Divine Creating was pushing downward pure and undefiled, to terminate in the chambers of the rational faculty. In these chambers were now prepared the battle-field between the evils from the mother and the Divine Love from the Creator; and in these chambers were later fought those terrific encounters which redeemed the human race from the evils that had heretofore domineered over the human kind.

The Word reached now into the throne hall of man, his reason, and spoke: "Let there be light!" And the time was at hand.

While they were there [in Bethlehem], the time was fulfilled that her child should be born, and she brought forth her first-born son.

The Lord came into the world by the power of the Word. The Word means Divine Truth. The universe is created thereby, and is preserved by it. Man was made by Divine Truth, because all things in him have relation to the understanding and the will,—the understanding being the receptacle of Divine Truth, and the will that of Divine Good.

God came into the world as Word, Divine Truth, Logos, Wisdom, Reason per se, Holy Spirit.

In the beginning was the Word and the Word was with God, and God was the Word. He was in the beginning with God, through Him *all things* came into being, and nothing came into being apart from Him. . . .

And the Word became Man and dwelt among us. We saw His glory, the glory of the Only-Begotten-of-the-Father, full of Grace and Truth. . . .

No man has ever seen God. The only-begotten-Son, He who is in the bosom of the Father, He has revealed Him.

Othmar Tobisch.

SWEDENBORG AMONG THE PHILOSOPHERS

By the Rev. Lewis Field Hite

THE systematic reader of Swedenborg needs to be acquainted with the thought, and especially with the current philosophy, of that day, to enable him to read in the light of the historical context as well as in the light of Swedenborg's own thought. It is important to bear in mind that Swedenborg wrote in the language of the learned, Scholastic Latin; he was bred and educated in the atmosphere of the learned; in his philosophy he used the terms, the ideas, and the principles of traditional philosophy, and of the new scientific revolution. Obviously, it would be a great help and a matter of great satisfaction, if we knew quite definitely just what use he made of the philosophers of his day and of previous ages.

Fortunately, we have in "A Philosopher's Note Book,"* a body of extracts which he made from the writings of the great philosophers from Plato to Leibniz, admirably adapted to the purpose of furnishing the material needed to trace with confidence Swedenborg's relation to the great philosophers of the human race. We have already, in a recent issue of this Review (July, 1931), given a brief notice of this book, in which its general character and some of its more important features are described. We have also, in *The New Philosophy* of July, 1932, discussed in some detail

**A Philosopher's Note Book; Excerpts from Philosophical Writers and from the Sacred Scriptures on a Variety of Philosophical Subjects, etc.* By Emanuel Swedenborg. Translated from the Latin, and edited with notes by Alfred Acton, M.A.D.Th., Philadelphia, Pa.; Swedenborg Scientific Association, 1931. XXIII, 547 pp., 8vo. $5.00.

the relation of Swedenborg to Plato. But it remains to attempt a similar task with the other philosophers quoted in the book.

Aside from Plato, the most important quotations are from Aristotle, Augustine, and Leibniz, although it is evident that Swedenborg was much interested in the writings of Malebranche and Wolff, and to a less extent in those of Rydelius and Bilfinger.

A glance at the index of topics with which the quotations are concerned gives us a valuable insight into Swedenborg's philosophical interest. According to the principle of logical priority, we begin with the excerpts which deal with metaphysics, for metaphysical principles are presupposed as the background in the treatment of other subjects, such as theology, psychology, or physics. This is evident when we ask insistently what we mean by such familiar terms as "substance," "matter," "form," "quality," "cause," "universals," "leasts," etc.

No better illustration of the constant background of metaphysical principles involved in our habitual as well as in our more technical thinking, nor of Swedenborg's position among the philosophers, could be chosen than the case of "substance." It is, like "matter," one of the most familiar words of our every day vocabulary, and Swedenborg uses it often, apparently in the traditional sense; and yet when we ask what precisely we mean by it, we become involved in the metaphysical difficulties which are incident to clear and systematic thinking on any and every subject.

Like many other familiar words, the term "substance" comes down to us through generations of deep reflection by the best minds of the race, and like so many common words it has such various associations and applications that the demand for a precise and constant meaning calls upon us to summon the whole body of our experience at once to the bar of critical reflection. Swedenborg's use of such terms is, of course, partly in the traditional sense and partly in a sense proper to his own system of thought. It would help

us to determine the meaning in particular instances, if we could be sure of his familiarity with traditional usages and with the original definitions of the terms. It is, therefore, just to our hand that we are not left to guess or to surmise what knowledge Swedenborg had of the definitions and discussions of metaphysical terms by previous philosophers. In fact he has fifteen pages of extracts from Plato, Aristotle, Descartes, Malebranche, Leibniz, Spinoza, Wolff, and Bilfinger, dealing with the meaning of "substance" and related concepts. We consequently know that he read, considered, and copied from Aristotle such statements as the following:

> Substance is that which is not predicated of a subject, but of which all other things are predicated.
>
> That which is primarily *Being,* and not any particular *Being,* but simply *Being,* is substance.
>
> Substance is the name given to simple bodies, . . . and universally to bodies, . . . and to parts of these.
>
> Again, the essence of the thing, the conception of which is a definition, is also called the substance of each thing.
>
> That which underlies a thing primarily is thought to be in the truest sense its substance.

This is a summary of the several meanings of "substance." There are two ideas which underlie these definitions: that of "substratum"; and that of simple *being.* The idea of "simple being," being which is not the being of any particular thing, is the idea which Plato in his Dialogue entitled the *Parmenides,* treated so elaborately under the name of "the One." Although the clear definition of the meaning of "substance" goes back to Aristotle, the idea of what *is* in and of itself was first elaborately discussed by Plato in the *Parmenides.* Swedenborg has several pages of extracts from this Dialogue, and evidently gave much attention to the arguments for the identity of that which *is* (in this absolute sense) and "the One." He remarks at the conclusion of the extracts: "By means of the One, Plato in his *Parmenides* sets forth the nature of simple substance." In fact Plato's idea of "the One" is involved and presupposed in Aristotle's definition of substance as that which is

not predicated of any subject, but of which all other things are predicated. In other words, substance is the underlying substratum of the qualities by which we know it; it is the unchanging essence of the thing, that which makes the thing to be what it is. Swedenborg sums up the meanings of substance thus: "Aristotle defines substance to be an *ens* which subsists *per se,* and sustains accidents, [i.e.,] determinable qualities." If anyone is curious to know how much Swedenborg was interested in the notion of substance, let him read "An Introduction to Rational Psychology" in "The Economy of the Animal Kingdom." There are few of the puzzles involved in this notion which Swedenborg does not here recognize and deal with. He was much concerned with the meaning and nature of the *first* substance, for the reason that he looked upon the soul as the first substance of the animal body, and its life. For this reason he discussed the nature of the first substance, and distinguished between the first substance of nature and the first substances of the several series which constitute the body of nature. The notion of substance here is that of a primary body from which the successive series of bodies are derived. This first substance of the world is the primary body from which all the other bodies of the world are derived. This first substance, however, is not self-subsisting, for it is created by God, who is, as Spinoza held, the only real self-existing substance. So the meaning of substance, when pursued to the end, takes us to the acknowledgment of God.

We have seen how intimately Swedenborg's use of the word "substance" is related both to Aristotle's definitions and to Plato's discussions of the nature of "the One" and of simple being. We should not be surprised to find that, in the case of the idea of God also, Swedenborg appropriates the best thought of Plato and Aristotle, with those of Augustine and Leibniz especially among Christian philosophers. Plato is the original source of much of our deepest philosophical thinking, and his thoughts have been handed

down through tradition and through books to our day; in this way they have become the common property of our Christian civilization. No doubt Swedenborg, as an educated man, was familiar with these thoughts from his youth; but we can imagine his interest and satisfaction in selecting and copying from Plato such statements as these:

> That of the things that are best, there is a beginning which is The Best; and that this beginning is to be called God.
>
> There is a conviction in the souls of men that God is the beginning, the middle, and the end of all things; and that His force and power efficaciously permeate all parts of the universe; that His providence watches over human affairs.
>
> God who created the world wisely governs the same by His providence.
>
> If this providence be denied, God is denied.
>
> From which it follows that this world which is before our eyes is necessarily the likeness of something. . . . He willed that so far as possible all things generated should be resemblances of Himself.
>
> There is no need at all of arguments to prove that God is,—a truth which all men know by nature.
>
> Our effort should be to fly from earth to heaven as quickly as possible. But such flight consists in becoming like unto God, and being made conformable to Him, so far as is possible. It is justice, however, and holiness, combined with wisdom, that makes us like God; and of this men cannot be easily persuaded.

Here we have clearly stated six of the fundamental principles of Swedenborg's teaching about God: namely, (1) that God is the First and the Last, the Beginning of all things; (2) that He is the Creator of the world; (3) that His Providence extends to the greatest and the leasts of creation; (4) that we become as far as possible like God in a wise and good life; (5) that the created universe with all things in it is an image of God; (6) that all men by nature have a knowledge of God. These principles, as derived from the Lord's own words, are common to Christian thought throughout its history; but the fact that Swedenborg took the trouble to copy them from Plato, giving the exact reference in each case, establishes a direct connection between them which is historically important. The great number of extracts from Plato on many and various sub-

jects shows that Swedenborg was a familiar reader of that philosopher, and valued his philosophy.

Under the heading "God," Aristotle repeats Plato in some statements, and adds or develops others. The excerpts give a liberal space to Aristotle's discussion of the Infinite, which goes quite properly with what he says about God. In selecting passages for copying, Swedenborg seems to have been especially interested in those which present Aristotle's view of God's relation to the world. Both Plato and Aristotle use the language of polytheism when they have in mind popular beliefs; but when they speak for themselves, they are very distinct and positive monotheists. For example, Aristotle says:

> All men have some conception respecting the gods; and all, whether Greeks or barbarians, who believe in the existence of gods, have attributed to those gods the supreme place.
>
> Though He is invisible in every thing of mortal nature, yet is He discerned from His works.
>
> Though God is one, He is called by many names, being named from all those loves which He sets forth to view.

This is one way of saying that the names of the many gods of Greek mythology are names of the apprehended aspects of the one God. God was for Aristotle the Creator and Preserver of all things; his language at this point is in full agreement with Christianity as well as with Swedenborg. On the relation between God and the world we have the following:

> The world is defined as that order and digest of universal things which is from God and is preserved by God.
>
> The universe was established and brought together both from God and by God; . . . no nature could be sufficiently instructed for its own preservation as to be given charge of its own safety without the ruling of God.
>
> God is the preserver of all things comprehended in the nature of things; and likewise He is the Begetter of all things whatsoever that are perfected in this world.
>
> God is in the universe, and on the other hand all things are in Him; so all things [in the soul] move by virtue of the deity existing within us.

God operates according to nature.

The Divine nature first sends its force into those things which are its first containants, and from these into those which are further and further distant, until it has permeated throughout the universe of things.

Here we have a doctrine of degrees. A similar statement is:

That body most greatly feels His force and enjoys His divinity, which is situated nearest to Him; then that which holds the second place; and each body thereafter according to the order of position as constituted by nature, all the way to our position.

These quotations are enough to show, not the dependence of Swedenborg upon Aristotle, but their agreement in the fundamental ideas about God; viz., that God is the Creator and Preserver of the world, and that He operates according to successive degrees. These ideas are, of course, the common possession of Christianity from the beginning, and of the Hebrew religion as well. The matter of interest for us here is, that Swedenborg found statements of these doctrines in Aristotle, and copied them, thus establishing a direct relation between them.

Swedenborg has a considerable body of extracts from a book entitled *De Sapientia Divina secundum Aegyptios* (Concerning the Divine Wisdom according to the Egyptians). This book has a curious and obscure history. It was incorporated in Du Val's edition of Aristotle's *Opera Omnia* (Paris, 1654), and in other editions. Swedenborg suspected its authorship, but he was much impressed by the high character of its teaching. To a reader familiar with Neo-Platonism, the book is obviously the work of one of the later Neo-Platonists, written probably in the third or fourth century A.D. During the Alexandrian period (300 B.C. to 300 A.D.), it was the fashion for authors to give authority to their writings by assigning their productions to the great men of antiquity, such as Pythagoras, Plato, or Aristotle. Such forgeries, though done for the most part with good intentions, sometimes present scholars with serious problems. This practice was especially character-

istic of the Neo-Pythagoreans, who were prone to trace their views back to "the ancient wisdom," to the Egyptians, the Persians, the Jews, and the Hindus. This helps to explain how the "Wisdom according to the Egyptians" came to have a place in the Aristotelian corpus. Swedenborg found it in Du Val's edition and made copious extracts from it. He was evidently much impressed by the scheme of the universe which this Neo-Platonic writing presented. The outline of the Neo-Platonic scheme is presented in the following sentence: "By means of the Word, God created the active intellect; and thus by means of the latter the common soul (*animus* [the world soul]); and this created the sense, and is also infused into plants." The writer of this sentence ascribes the system to Aristotle, but it is evident that it is Neo-Platonism influenced by the Jewish and Greek philosophy of Alexandria. The "Word" here is the "Logos" of Philo and the Stoics. The phrase "God created" is Jewish and probably also Christian. The scheme of Plotinus is: *"Tò 'Én"* (The One), *"Nous"* (Thought), *"Psychê"* (the Soul), *"Physis"* (Nature), and the Sense World of Bodies. These follow in generative order from the First, the One; and it is obvious that we have here a series of degrees, which is a close parallel to Swedenborg's series of the Divine, the Spiritual, the Natural, and the Corporeal. There are other striking resemblances. Perhaps the most important is: "God is present in all existent things according to the appearance and nature of each; for He it is who informs their essence in accommodation to the condition of each." This reminds us of the formula, "Influx is according to the state of the recipient." Another striking resemblance is the sentence: "The world that comes to the senses is an image, both of that world which is perceived by the Intelligence alone, and of the intelligences which are within it." This, of course, comes from Plato; but it is significant that Swedenborg approved it in its new dress, and copied it.

Neo-Platonism was engrafted upon Christianity in no insignificant measure by Augustine, and was afterwards

elaborated in the writings of that mysterious figure, Dionysius the Areopagite, probably of the fourth century or a little later, and highly developed by Scotus Erigena, the great mystic and teacher in the time of Charles the Bald, about 850. The strain of Neo-Platonic mysticism has run through Christian history almost from the beginning. The best representative of this mysticism in the Church of a later date was Meister Eckhart, the great German preacher of the thirteenth century.

The excerpts from Augustine, Leibniz, Malebranche, and Grotius do little more than repeat the great thoughts of Plato and Aristotle; but they do, especially those of Leibniz and Malebranche, add important statements about the relation between God and man. Thus Augustine says: "God is the creator of all things, . . . than whom nothing is more secret, nothing more present; or of whom it is hard to say where He is, and still harder where He is not." This reminds us of Swedenborg's hard saying, "The Divine fills all the spaces of the universe apart from space," and "is in all time apart from time." In other words, men have found difficulty in thinking of God either in space or apart from space. Another striking statement of Augustine's is: "The whole of God is contained by the creature, and this not by parts"; also "God gives to all, losing nothing Himself." This is like Swedenborg's principle, "The Divine is the same in greatests and in leasts." We have here also a reminder of Swedenborg's philosophy of love; it is very essence of love to give itself wholly to others, and yet nothing of the love is lost. Augustine was past master in psychological analysis; he was also an adept in describing religious experience, especially his own rich experience. One of his penetrating observations is: "To ascend to God is to enter into oneself, and not only to enter into oneself but into inmosts, and in a certain ineffable way to transcend oneself. For he who transcends himself, entering interiorly and penetrating intrinsically, truly ascends to God." This of course is Neo-Platonic mysticism, with which Augustine was well

acquainted. Augustine here is thinking of ascent to God in thought. We have the same process in Plotinus.

Malebranche was a disciple of Descartes, but went much further in detail. He elaborated the relation between God and man, and many of his statements are really far advanced. Some of these follow. Here is an example of how he pushes on to details. After stating that God alone enlightens all men, he adds, "without whom truths, even of the most simple kind, could not be understood, even the sun, though in itself lucent, would not pour its light upon us." He seems to approach the doctrine of Correspondence in the statement, "Ideas, which to us represent creatures, are nothing but the perfections of God, harmoniously corresponding to those creatures and representing them." With some extension and qualification this statement could be brought into agreement with Swedenborg's doctrine, that in the spiritual world the animals and plants are the spontaneous objectification of the affections and ideas of the angels. Another important idea is: "Inasmuch as that natural love whereby we are moved towards God, is the same as the natural inclination whereby we are carried towards good in general, towards infinite good, the supreme good, it is manifest that all spirits love God with this kind of love, since He alone is universal good, infinite good, the supreme good." Swedenborg spoke from experience when he tells us that in the spiritual world the angels are transparent to each other. Malebranche seems to have had a glimpse of this when he wrote: "When justice and order shall flourish, and we shall be delivered from the captivity of our body, then by that inmost union which will exist among us, we should be able to open our minds to each other, after the manner in which the angels of the heavens would seem to act." In the following statement he anticipates some of our modern philosophers, as he is in a way anticipated by Xenophanes, in his opposition to "anthropomorphism": "It must not be imagined with the anthropomorphists that the shape of God must be like the human shape because the latter seems to be the most perfect of all."

Neither, he goes on to add, "must it be supposed that God's spirit has human thoughts, and that his mind is like ours." The true description of Him would be that He is "complete Being, Being infinite and universal." This is reminiscent of the "negative theology" of the post-Aristotelian philosophy, and of some of the early Church Fathers. It survives today in such phrases as "We cannot know the essence of God" and "The finite mind cannot comprehend the infinite." As a matter of fact, we do know the essence of God when we know that He is infinite love and wisdom; and as matter of fact the finite mind does comprehend many types of the infinite,—for example, the number system. Malebranche has a curiously interesting, but inconsistent, discussion of the nature of love; like so many others he is confused about the difference between self-love and the love of others, and like so many others, he is unable to see how there can be any love which is not self-love.

Leibniz was one of the great philosophers of all ages. He was not only metaphysician, psychologist, and historian, but he was a great theologian. He was one of the few men who have worked in these several fields in the full light of history. He was familiar with ancient as well as with modern history. This gave his thought a maturity and a completeness which makes his philosophy a perennial source of inspiration and guidance. Swedenborg was evidently an appreciative reader of Leibniz; from the "Theodicy" he has about one hundred and fifty excerpts, with number of page given, so that we can go to the original text in every case. In fact he gives the exact reference with all his excerpts. We transcribe here those excerpts which seem most nearly related to the teaching of Swedenborg,—all from the "Theodicy." After remarking that "God is the first reason of things, and as intelligent cause is infinite and absolutely perfect in power, wisdom, and goodness," Leibniz goes on to say:

Since all things are interconnected, we must conclude that He is *one*. His intellect is the origin of essences, and his will is the origin of existences. Here we have in a few words a demonstration of the

one God with his perfections, and of the origin of all things through Him.

This is another way of saying that God is Divine Love and Wisdom, the Author and Ruler of the created universe, and that His existence is revealed in the order of this universe. We are reminded of Swedenborg's principle that the Lord may be known from His works. The idea of order is further developed in the statement:

> God is the whole of order; He ever preserves the sympathy of proportions; He presides over universal harmony; all beauty is the effluvium of His rays; from which it is a manifest conclusion that true piety, nay, and true felicity, consists in the love of God; but a love illuminated, whose order has light as its companion. God cannot be loved unless His perfections be known; and this knowledge comprises the principles of sincere piety.

Swedenborg teaches the same thing in His usual direct and simple way, "The Lord is order itself."

Leibniz in his characteristic way gives his view of the nature of Divine Providence:

> The dependence of all things on God extends to all things possible, . . . for unless God existed, nothing would be possible. . . . Things actual depend upon God in respect both to their existence and to their acting. In respect to their existing, since all things are freely created by God; and are also preserved by God; nor is that teaching wrong which declares that Divine preservation is continued creation, just as a ray goes forth from the sun continually. Things depend upon God in respect to their acting; for God concurs in the actions of things, inasmuch as within actions there is something of perfection, and this perfection must certainly emanate from God. God's concurrence, even the ordinary or non-miraculous, is at the same time both immediate and special.

Swedenborg's teaching is that the Divine Providence extends to the leasts as well as to the greatests.

Finally, Leibniz was the wise Christian theologian in his teaching:

> It must be declared that sufficient grace is denied to no one who desires it. That necessary grace will not be lacking to him who does what in him lies, is an ancient saying; and Augustine himself,

following older writers, has noted that God deserts only the deserter.

These parallels between Swedenborg and Leibniz are important in showing not Swedenborg's dependence upon Leibniz and the other philosophers, but in emphasizing the common inheritance from these philosophers of ideas and principles which we all possess more or less, and use to some extent, without knowing their origin or full significance. Swedenborg shared that inheritance, and made his own use of it. In other words, these parallels help us to place Swedenborg in his historical position, at the same time that they help us to get more surely and clearly the meaning of the terms he uses, which is the first requirement of satisfactory and profitable reading.

We have dwelt at some length upon the body of excerpts which deal with the nature of God and His operations. The field of these operations is in part the field of "Nature," using the word "nature" to mean the world of physical bodies and their behavior. It is true that historically the meaning of the word "nature" includes ideas of the forces which move bodies, and also ideas of the life which actuates and directs the movements of plant and animal bodies. Some of the bodies we see and touch, as for example rocks and logs, boards and pieces of furniture, are moved by the push or pull of other bodies; but some, the bodies of animals, seem to move of themselves; so too the heavenly bodies, the planets and stars. The magnet draws and moves iron filings and blocks of iron. These various ways bodies have of behaving point not only to distinctions among bodies, but also to a realm of causes, to forces and powers which bodies do not intrinsically possess, and which are foreign to the definition of bodies. As a consequence the word "nature," when used to include both of these realms, is highly ambiguous and shifting in its meaning. However, the philosophers and likewise Swedenborg use the word constantly to mean the world of bodies and their behavior, and this involves God's operations in the "world of nature."

Let us then consider some of the more striking statements about nature contained in the excerpts, as these will reveal the points of Swedenborg's interest.

The treatment of nature in the sense of the physical universe obviously involves matter and motion, body and form, action and cause, end and purpose, potential and actual; together with other topics, such as force, energy, mechanism, mode, modification, substance, elements, universals, particulars, atmospheres, life, death, degrees, greatests, leasts, hypothesis, correspondence, representation, image, etc. There are extracts on all these topics; but although each would serve as a connecting link with Swedenborg's teaching, our task is too restricted to cover this field. We must confine ourselves to the term "nature," which has abundant complications of its own.

Perhaps the most familiar occurrence of the word "nature" is in the phrase, "The nature of things." Aristotle, from whom most of the extracts on nature are taken, uses the word in several senses, which may be exemplified as follows:

If in the nature of things simple motion exists.

From this it is evident that in the nature of things there is in a body some substance other than those constitutions [constituents?] of bodies which we find around us, more Divine than all of these and prior to them.

All things which are continually moved by some internal principle and arrive at some end, exist by nature.

We say that as yet a thing has no nature, if it has no matter and form; that therefore exists by nature which consists of both of these.

Of existing things, some exist by nature, and some from other causes. Animate beings exist by nature. . . . All things which exist by nature are seen to contain within themselves the principle of motion and of rest.

Nature is a kind of principle and cause why that thing moves or is at rest wherein she is primitively *per se* and not by accident.

The principle of things is nature rather than matter.

Nature is defined in one way as being the first subject-matter in everything that contains in itself the principle of motion and mutation.

Nature is also defined as the substance of those things which exist by nature.

Nature is the principle of the individual things which come into being; of these things one stands in relation of means to the other; but God is the author of all causes.

God and nature do nothing in vain.

Nature does nothing in vain; for all things whatsoever in nature exist for some end, or are the conditions of things that exist for some end. The end is the work of nature.

Analyzing these statements, we find that the important senses of the word may be expressed in the phrases, "nature of the thing," "a thing has a nature," "a thing acts by nature, or according to its nature," "nature acts or does something," "the nature of the thing is such and such," that is, we have definitions of nature. Nature is a kind of principle, the substance or essence of the thing, which makes the thing to be what it is, and from which it exists and acts. From the general idea of the nature of bodies we pass to the idea of the world of bodies, and we have the familiar and important idea of things in nature, nature as the physical world, the natural world. So much for the Aristotelian usage.

Swedenborg also uses the word variously, especially in two prevailing senses, that of a universal principle acting throughout the world of bodies, and the world of bodies itself. The first is prominent in his scientific works; the second is characteristic of his theological works. For example:

Stupendous phenomena of nature are exhibited by the magnet and the mariner's needle.

One extreme of nature is above the senses of man, and the other below them.

Though nature multiply the heavens and the mundane systems by myriads.

Nature acts by the simplest means.

There are many who ascribe all things to nature.

On the other hand:

All things in nature correspond to Spiritual things.

While they behold the wonders of nature.

Every one from things visible in nature may confirm himself in favor of the Divine.

Space and time are proper to nature.

Universal nature is representative of the Lord's kingdom.

Nature is the ultimate of Divine order.

Swedenborg does not give life to nature, but ascribes all the operations of nature to God. In much of our thought, past and present, Nature (written with a capital) is personified, and given all the powers and intelligence of personality.

With nature man is usually and properly connected; sometimes included within nature. Man occupies a peculiar and privileged position; he is partly in nature, as to his body in the world of bodies, he is also as to his soul in the world of minds, in the spiritual world. The soul of man has been a subject of interest and of deep concern all down through the ages. The old Pythagoreans made the life and destiny of the soul the dominant feature of their philosophy. Christianity inherited from Plato and Aristotle a characteristic doctrine about the nature of the soul. Swedenborg spent almost the whole period of his scientific career in pursuit of a more definite knowledge of the soul. It is not surprising that he has in all more than seventy pages of excerpts on the soul: of these twenty-two are from Plato and Aristotle, eighteen from Augustine, and nine from Leibniz. With the soul we have the related topics: mind, intellect, reason, will, heart, sensation, memory, imagination, representation, harmony, correspondence, appearance, truth, wisdom, intelligence, ideas, faith, good, affection, pleasure, cupidity, virtue, honor, justice, happiness, ambition, evil, error, vices, sin, hell, heaven, immortality, religion, piety, spirit, temptation, grace, prayer, miracles, Last Judgment, New Man, and others of the same kind, each and all of which are well represented in the extracts. But we must confine our attention to those on the soul.

Most of our ideas of the soul go back to Plato. His ideas have been appropriated by Christianity, and in this way have become familiar to successive generations. Swe-

denborg, in his scientific period, devoted himself systematically to acquiring a definite and satisfactory knowledge of the soul as an organized substance. He worked with the ideas that were handed down to his day, but he was disappointed in finding what he wanted. When, however, he was spiritually enlightened and admitted into the spiritual world with all his senses and faculties in full vigor and exercise, he discovered that the soul is the man himself, which in this world has a body, not that he is a body that has a soul.

Plato's description of the soul is in agreement with Swedenborg's, but not as definite or complete. We may sum up Plato's doctrine in a few of his most characteristic statements, statements which attracted the attention of Swedenborg, and which he was interested to copy into his Note Book. The *locus classicus* of all discourse about the soul is Plato's "Phaedo." From this Swedenborg makes most of his extracts, but it is important to note that he takes a considerable number from the *Timaeus*, the Dialogue which preserves features of the Pythagorean philosophy, and which contains his theory of creation. A few of the extracts are from other Dialogues, such as the *Phaedrus* and the *Laws*.

Plato had a philosophy of the soul. The soul was the source of the motions of the body; it had a character of Divine excellence; it was immortal; death was a release of the soul from the body; there are pure and impure souls; there are two parts of the soul, the rational and the irrational (what we would, perhaps, call the spiritual and the natural). The first step in the philosophy of the soul is to affirm that the soul is, next to God, the most excellent of all things.

> The soul is something which, next to God, is the most divine of all things, and is most distinctly proper to man, being that part of him that is most powerful and most excellent.
>
> The necessity of a soul endowed with mind is by far the greatest of all necessities.
>
> God found that of the things discerned in nature no one devoid

of intelligence is more excellent than one that is intelligent: and that there can be no intelligence without an indwelling soul.

The doctrine that the soul should rule the body has a conspicuous place in Plato's philosophy of a good life.

The soul rules the body, and the things pertaining thereto serve.

The soul is endowed with mind, while the body is devoid of mind; the one is the ruler, the other is the subject; the latter furnishes no cause of any affection, the former is the cause of all affections.

Plato is justly famous for his doctrine of immortality. His demonstration of the immortality of the soul is of fundamental metaphysical importance, as it involves the metaphysics of motion, a problem which engaged Swedenborg's systematic attention throughout his entire scientific and philosophical career.

Every soul is immortal. For that which continually moves is immortal.

Therefore only that which moves itself can never cease to move, since it can never desert itself; but it is the source and beginning of motion to all other things that move.

Since therefore it is clear that that which moves itself is eternal, is there any one who will deny that this is the essential nature to be attributed to souls?

As the soul is the primary motion of the corporeal life, so God is the primary motion of nature.

If the truth of things is perpetually in the soul, must not the soul be also immortal?

If the body dissolves and perishes while the man still remains, yet the soul ever renews that which is worn out.

If death is the dissolution of everything, it would be a great gain for evil men when they die to be delivered from the body, also from their evils, as well as from their souls; but now when it is manifest that the soul is immortal, she has no other escape from evils, and no other safety, than to become good and wise in the highest degree.

What Plato says about death is very striking; and it has become a permanent inheritance in the body of Christian thought.

Is death anything else than the freeing of the soul from the body?

Truly the soul departs to a good and provident God. . . . If it be a pure soul, it proceeds to some Divine Being like to itself. . . . And

Religion
Berkeley, Calif.

when it has come thither, it becomes wholly blessed, free from error, ignorance, fears, etc.

The impure soul . . . is held in aversion and shunned by every other soul, the latter being unwilling to be either its companion or its guide; but it wanders around, oppressed by the utmost distress, [and then, after certain periods have elapsed, it is carried by a certain necessity to the place assigned for its abode]. But the soul which has passed through life with purity and moderations, having the gods as its companions and guides, will dwell in a place assigned to it.

From the time of Plato on, the relation between the soul and the body became a subject of constant debate, which culminated in the doctrine of "Pre-established Harmony," formulated by Leibniz, and modified by Malebranche and others. Plato was the first to clarify the distinction between the sense-world and the thought-world, and to make the distinction between the soul and the body clear. It is not easy to say how seriously he took the Pythagorean doctrine of the pre-existence of the soul, although his arguments in favor of it fit into his scheme of absolute Ideas. It may have been simply his bow to history and especially to Pythagoreanism, which at one time at least interested him as the most advanced body of physical speculation. It is certain that Swedenborg ignored the doctrine, and attached little or no importance to the statements of it; he was interested in the actual present nature of the soul and its relation to the body, and this interest is indicated by the extracts he made. For example, from Plato:

There are within us three kinds of souls (*anima*). . . . Of that which is the most excellent, we must believe that God has appointed it to each of us as our dæmon [guardian angel].

Of the human soul, one part partakes of reason and is intelligent, while the other is devoid of reason and is unwise.

Because of the soul's power, [the body] seems to move itself. . . . The one is the ruler, the other the subject.

Next to God there is nothing more august than the soul, and nothing more excellent; therefore the soul should be cultivated and honored with all solicitude. . . . He grievously sins who sets the highest good in this life, and does not believe that there is another life wherein full and accumulated happiness remains for the good

and pious. This is the most detestable and vilest kind of ignorance. (He also sins in the same way) who sets the form of the body above the form of virtue, and deems the body to be more excellent than the soul.

This preference of the life of the body to a life of virtue is one of the diseases of the soul.

We account lack of intelligence to be a disease of the soul (*anima*), and of this disease we have two kinds, Insanity and Ignorance. Therefore whatever passion induces one or the other of these is to be called a sickness of the soul. Excessive pleasure and grief must be judged as being the most grievous of the diseases of the soul; . . . for in these states man is little capable of reason. Again when the soul (*animus*) is afflicted with pain, it likewise suffers much depravity because of the body.

Disease therefore is to be dreaded and avoided, but death with which it is so constantly associated is a blessing and is to be welcomed, primarily for the reason that

In death, the man does not perish, for his immortal soul, which must be considered as the true man, still survives after the death of the body.

Some of the things which Plato says about souls after they have left the body have an interesting bearing upon certain views held in "spiritistic" circles, and especially upon the numerous reports of so-called spirit phenomena. Speaking of the polluted and impure souls who wander about friendless and desolate, he says that such souls are not wholly set free from the taint of bodily grossness, and are therefore visible; then he adds, "Therefore the souls that are seen are not the souls of the good, but of the wicked." This is in agreement with Swedenborg's caution, that open intercourse with spirits should not be sought, but avoided; that good spirits do not seek to force themselves upon man's conscious participation, but that evil spirits delight in obsessing and controlling man's conscious life.

Plato's impressive teachings about God, nature, and the soul, are fairly well represented in the extracts; and these extracts serve as a pretty good index of the extent to which

these teachings have become the common property of succeeding generations. The other philosophers do little more than repeat the language of Plato. Aristotle wrote a special treatise on the soul; Swedenborg read it and made copious extracts from it. The extracts deal for the most part with the relation between the soul and the body. On the nature of the soul itself, they only emphasize and develop the ideas of Plato. Aristotle accepted Plato's distinction between the rational and the non-rational part of the soul; he re-affirmed the immortality of the soul; he made it a point to emphasize and develop the principle that the soul is the source of motion in the body; this is equivalent to maintaining that the soul is the life of the body. Apart from the operation, control, and direction of the rational soul, the sense life is blind and essentially irrational. As the general definition of the soul, Aristotle says:

> The soul is necessarily a substance.
>
> Speaking universally, the soul is an essence which consists in reason.

More specifically he says:

> The soul is the cause and principle of a living body.
>
> We define living as intellect, sensation, motion and state in regard to place, also as motion in regard to nutrition, and decay and growth.
>
> But it is the soul by which primarily we live, sensate, and understand.
>
> Moreover, the soul is that whence proceeds the first motion of a thing in place.
>
> All philosophers define the soul by motion or by sensation.

These features of the philosophy of the soul have been made permanent elements in the doctrine of the soul from that day to this. They were propagated by Augustine, and perpetuated by Leibniz, Malebranche, and others. Augustine was well educated in the philosophy of his time, as also in the theology of the day. He was familiar with the philosophy of the Greeks and the Alexandrians, and especially Neo-Platonism. The nature of the soul was a leading

topic in all the schools of philosophy, and Augustine pursued the subject with great power of analysis as well as intellectual grasp. He had a firm grasp of the idea of man as a whole. He says:

> Man consists of two substances only, namely, soul and body, the soul with its reason, and the body with its senses; which senses, however, are not moved by the body, without the association of the soul. The soul, on the other hand, retains its rationality even without the body.
>
> We believe that man alone has a substantial soul which continues to live after the body has been laid aside, and retains, in a lively way, its senses and endowments.

Augustine was, as were others of his day, much concerned with the question as to how the soul was created, and he labored strenuously to refute what he considered the false ideas current on this subject.

> Whether God made the soul from that which had no existence whatever, that is, from nothing, or from something which, being already made by Him, existed spiritually but was not yet soul, is a question worthy of enquiry.
>
> In matters of this kind, therefore, it is safer not to deal with human conjectures, but to search well into Divine testimonies.
>
> We must therefore believe and understand, nor in any way doubt, what a right faith teaches, that the soul is from God as a thing made by Him,—not by a nature the same as His,—whether He begat it, or put it forth in some other way.
>
> But we declare that the creation of the soul is known solely to the Creator of all things; . . . and when the body has been formed, the soul is created and infused into it.

Augustine was insistent that the soul is one whole, and steadfastly opposed the idea that the soul has parts, or that there are two souls, namely, the rational and the non-rational. He says:

> But we declare that in man there is one soul, and one only, which both vivifies the body by association therewith, and disposes itself by its own reason,—a soul possessing in itself liberty of choice, so that in the thought of its substance it can choose what it wills.

This whole which the soul is, has various functions, and

these functions are what constitute the soul. This is stated in a notable passage which anticipates some of the results of modern psychological analysis.

It is said that sense, imagination, reason, intellect, intelligence, and all these in the soul are nothing else than the soul herself. With respect to each other, and for the sake of various exercises, they are of one property or another, but they are one essence of reason and one soul. The properties are, indeed, one, but in respect to essence they are one in the soul and are the same as the soul.

The words "soul," "spirit," "mind," were used more or less interchangeably, both before and after the time of Augustine. He has this to say in the way of distinguishing them:

The soul and spirit are the same, although spirit means one thing, and soul another. For spirit is predicated of substance, and soul of vivification. The essence is the same, but the property is different. For the one and the same spirit is called spirit in respect to itself, and soul in respect to the body. It is spirit in that it is rational substance endowed with reason; it is soul in that it is the life of the body.

The distinction between mind and soul is stated in the following terms:

When I say mind, I mean nothing else than the soul; but I call it mind for one reason, and soul for another. The mind is so called from the fact that it is eminent in the soul, being that more excellent force of the soul from which proceeds intelligence.

With Augustine, as with Plato and Aristotle, the soul is characterized by a high degree of excellence: "The rational soul when pure is nearer to God than all created things." With respect to the presence and operation of the soul in the body, Augustine accepts the principle of Plotinus "that the whole soul is present in the whole body, and in its several parts."

The whole soul is simultaneously present throughout all the parts of the body; nor is she less in the smaller parts and greater in the larger. But, more intensely in one place, more laxly in another, the soul is wholly present in all the parts, and wholly present in each single part. For as the whole of God is everywhere present

in the world and in each of His creatures, so the whole of the soul is everywhere present in the whole of her body, as in a world of her own, though more intensely in the heart and brain; just as God is said to be especially present in heaven.

The whole soul sees, the whole soul remembers the things seen; the whole soul hears, smells, tastes, and discerns; the whole soul wills, thinks, loves; she can also think in part and love in part.

One of Augustine's notable statements is: "That the souls of the dead are not sensible of the affairs of the living." This we recognize as in agreement with Swedenborg's constant teaching.

In Leibniz, the treatment of the soul is complicated with his theory of Monads and his doctrine of Pre-established Harmony. Swedenborg seems to have been most interested in what he says about the origin of the soul. On this subject the most characteristic statement Leibniz makes is:

My own opinion is that souls, and, speaking generally, simple substances, can have neither a commencement, except by creation, nor an end, except by annihilation. . . . I have therefore inferred that what we call the generation of an animal is nothing else than a transformation and augmentation. Therefore, since the body itself has been already organized prior to conception, it must be supposed to have been already animated and possessed of the same soul.

This is in brief his theory of the origin of the soul, and is for him only another way of saying that souls are monads.

The extracts show that Swedenborg gave much thought to the theories about the Intercourse between the Soul and the Body. In all there are one hundred and fifteen pages of extracts on the soul; of these sixty-one are on the Intercourse between the Soul and the Body. The theories represented are: (I) Physical Influx, which was really a theory of interaction, that is, the soul acted upon the body, and the body upon the soul. This is the common-sense theory, based apparently upon common observation. (II) The theory which is usually called "Occasionalism," but is here called the "System of Assistance." This theory is, that God Himself makes the connection between the actions of

the soul and those of the body, on occasion. Both the body and the soul act from God, and God causes the act of the soul to be fitted to the act of the body. The result is that the soul acts on the occasion of the act of the body, and the body acts on the occasion of the act of the soul. The doctrine of Occasionalism was advocated by Descartes and Malebranche; but it was Malebranche who developed the doctrine in detail, and he did it in an interesting and significant way. Swedenborg makes numerous extracts from Malebranche, showing his interest in reading Malebranche, who devoted himself to expounding the relation between God and man, and succeeded admirably well. (III) Pre-established Harmony. The extracts on this subject are mostly from Leibniz, Wolff, and Bilfinger. Leibniz, the author of the theory, maintained that the relation between soul and body is a metaphysical relation, and that this relation was established at creation, such that the actions and states of each follow the ordained order, and yet proceed in harmony, or in one to one correspondence. He rejected Physical Influx and Occasionalism on the ground that they made the connection between soul and body a constant miracle; he puts the miracle back to the beginning, in the act of creation.

Swedenborg, evidently, studied these theories closely; he rejected the first and third on the ground that they were based on appearances and fallacies, but he seems to have adopted the second, which he identified with the doctrine of spiritual influx. Occasionalism may be interpreted as in part a theory of spiritual influx; but although the result is brought about by the operation of God, the actions of the body determine the actions of the soul, as much as the actions of the soul determine those of the body; in neither case is there any influx properly speaking.

We have selected and collated the more significant extracts on three main topics,—God, nature, and the soul. In these the connection with Swedenborg's teaching is obvious to those familiar with his writings, and therefore we have

not taken the time and space to juxtapose the one to the other. The constant purpose has been to show the extent to which Swedenborg was familiar with the authors quoted, and thus to throw definite light on his historical position. The book before us is valuable on its own account; it gives direct acquaintance with the field of philosophy from Plato to Swedenborg's day, and especially an acquaintance with those features which interested Swedenborg especially. We have had to leave out of consideration many topics of philosophical importance, some of which we enumerated above. The importance of the book for students of Swedenborg is, that it gives the needed background for getting more definitely the significance of his language.

There are three prime requisites for reading Swedenborg satisfactorily: (1) he must be read in the light of previous thought as well as the thought of his own day; (2) he must also be read in the light of the most advanced thought of our day; and (3) finally he must be read in the light of his own original thought. With this preparation the reader will find that Swedenborg is the creator of a new field of knowledge and of thought, especially of the spiritual world.

Lewis F. Hite.

DAILY READING FOR SPIRITUAL SUSTENANCE

"Real faith is nothing else than the acknowledgment that a thing is so because it is true." So says Swedenborg toward the beginning of his little treatise on Faith. But this sentence as it stands leaves much to be desired, as it says nothing about a criterion of truth, and therefore it tends to give assurance to all shallow thinkers in their intellectual conceits. That there is need of some criterion beyond mere acknowledgment in the ordinary external sense is evident from the wide diversity of religious beliefs throughout the world, from the disagreement of Christian sects concerning fundamentals, from the prevalent naturalism of the age with its reliance upon the scientific method for the attainment of "truth," and from blatant atheism itself with its teeming progeny of falsities.

One of the reasons why the first Christian age came to an end soon after the middle of the eighteenth century was because there was no longer in the world any knowledge of religious truth that was not inextricably mixed with falsity. Before his education was taken in hand by spiritual powers, Swedenborg's own ideas of religious truth were mixed and blended with falsity; and that falsity was eliminated only gradually by the enlightenment that was imparted to him subsequent to 1744. It was his function as revelator to again make known to humanity the real truth about our Lord and Savior Jesus Christ, and of other matters concerning our salvation. That truth was amplified exceedingly beyond what was imparted to the uncomprehending world at the time of our Lord's life in the flesh; and Swedenborg's publishing of that truth for the instruction of all mankind constituted in its way the predicted Second Coming of the Lord, who is Truth Itself.

The statement with which we began is not left unmodified in its context. The general thesis of the opening section of Swedenborg's work on Faith is that "faith is an *internal* acknowledgment of truth"; and the thesis of the next section is that "the in-

ternal acknowledgment of truth, which is faith, exists with none but those who are in charity." This statement eliminates all who are unregenerate, and apparently narrows the possessors of real faith to a small minority of the human race, of whom (from that standpoint) certain New-Church men and women are especially blessed. Those of us who are undergoing the process of regeneration (or who think we are) are not surely progressing in our knowledge of real truth if we are trusting overmuch to our own intelligence in that search. We are wise in that search only if we accept as our instructor and guide him whom the Lord Himself appointed to that office. In short, we have practically been told by the Lord Himself that the truth it most behooves us to know and acknowledge is contained in the Sacred Scriptures as expounded and explained in the Writings of Swedenborg. Swedenborg asserts that his Writings set forth real truth; and certainly those who desire to be integral parts of the Lord's New Church cannot go astray in their pursuit of truth, if they persistently read and meditate upon the Word of our Lord and the Writings of the Lord's Servant, Swedenborg.

Bodily sustenance and growth depends upon the regular consumption of sufficient suitable edibles; and in like manner spiritual sustenance and growth can best proceed on a regular diet of sufficient suitable spiritual food. Daily reading in the Word and the Writings has naturally been advocated for that purpose; but facilities to that end have not been what they might well have been. Our "Book of Worship" contains an ample guide for that purpose (see pp. x-xxv); and we are admonished as to the wisdom of using it (see p. 441). But in order to use it for an annual perusal of the Heavenly Doctrines, one must have conveniently at hand a complete set of Swedenborg's Theological Works, which but few persons possess; therefore it is certain that it is but little used. Various other charts have been devised that are far more usable because of limited scope, generally requiring on the doctrinal side only ready access to one of the commoner volumes of Swedenborg or else a small compendium.

Our British brethren have been facing this same problem of facilitating the daily reading of the Word and the Writings, and have recently published what seems to us a most practical hand-

book to promote and encourage the custom. The little volume is entitled "All the Year Round"*; it consists of but 238 pages of thin paper bound in flexible cloth covers 4¼ by 6¾ inches in size, and it contains 365 disconnected selections from Swedenborg's Writings, averaging about 250 words each, and each accompanied by a reference to an assigned reading from the Word, for which purpose one's own Bible is to be used. As this compilation has been made by a committee of our English ministers, we can be sure that it is an excellent one for the purpose. Moreover, it is a guide that could be used year after year with good result; and its use can begin at any time. But if we may judge from a small figure one stamped on the back of the cover, it is apparently intended to follow this volume with one or more others. However that may be, unless something similar or better is published in this country, these little volumes should be of as much value here as in England; and we can see no reason why our own organization should not co-operate in the publication and use of them, so that all English-speaking New-Church people the world over who are so inclined might be using the same guide to daily reading of religious truth. The price of the present volume is forty cents net, postage three cents extra. We can heartily recommend it to our Women's Alliance and all others who may be interested, provided a sufficient supply can be procured from England. Of course plenty of copies of the next issue should be available, if ordered in advance of printing.

B. A. WHITTEMORE.

---

*_All the Year Round; Daily Readings for the New Church_ London: British New-Church Federation, 20 Hart Street. 238 pp., 16mo. 40c.

"REBIRTH AND GLORIFICATION"*

A volume entitled "Rebirth and Glorification" has recently been published by the Rev. Eldred Edward Iungerich, Pastor of the Pittsburgh Society of the General Church of the New Jerusalem, and is now before us for notice. It is divided into two contrasting parts, the first being on The Seven Days of Man's Spiritual Creation and dealing with Swedenborg's teachings concerning regeneration, and the second bearing the designation, A Ciceronian Epic in Seven Episodes, and setting forth his teachings concerning the Lord's Glorification. Following the title-page is a dedicatory poem "To Elizabeth Iungerich," preceded by a group portrait of two young children and their mother, who is evidently the person memorialized in the poem. While the poem cannot be praised much either as poetry or as verse, it is certainly a worthy effort to honor the memory of a beloved conjugial partner by her apparently long widowed mate.

The first part of the book, by the development of its thought, its mention of scriptural data, and its very numerous references to the Writings of Swedenborg, gives abundant evidence of its author's painstaking study of all that Swedenborg has to say on the subject of individual regeneration. This is a subject of supreme importance to which most persons pay no attention. The average church attendant, even if a communicant, apparently rarely gives a thought to the question of regeneration and salvation; and we have heard even of a New-Church minister of a past generation who, when questioned as to assurance of his own salvation, showed by his reply that he had thoughtlessly assumed it, having never had a doubt about it. According to Mr. Iungerich's opinion, regeneration is a rather rare thing.

The second part of the book consists of seven "episodes," in which the author imagines himself as the spirit of Cicero receiving enlightenment on religious truth. Episode one recalls

**Rebirth and Glorification.* By Eldred Edward Iungerich, Pittsburgh, Pa.; Church of the New Jerusalem. 1933. 138 pp., 12mo. $1.25.

Cicero's first conscious experiences after death, when things happen largely in accordance with the poetic ideas of his time. In the second episode Cicero becomes acquainted with the Apostles Peter and Paul; in the third, with personifications of Roman Catholic and Protestant Christianity in conflict; in the fourth, with Swedenborg; and in the last three he listens to a prolonged discussion about the Lord's Glorification and His Resurrection Body, at first between the spirits of two deceased New-Church ministers designated as Samuel and John, but finally with a person named Garland as principal speaker. As to the relative value of the various ideas set forth in this discussion we do not venture to express an opinion.

A female character named Athene, who seems to be Cicero's soul mate, figures significantly at times through the episodes; and we have noticed the same name beneath the woman's portrait previously mentioned as at the beginning of the volume.

B. A. WHITTEMORE.

Easter Cards
Christmas Cards

Celebrating the Birth and the Resurrection of Christ

Choice cards both of foreign and of domestic manufacture. Prices of Christmas Cards from 5 to 50 cents; of Easter Cards, 5 and 10 cents. Mail orders solicited, and satisfaction guaranteed.

The Massachusetts New-Church Union

134 Bowdoin St., Boston 9, Mass.

THE NEW CHURCH MAGAZINE

The Quarterly Organ of the General Conference of the New Church in Great Britain is the oldest New-Church periodical. It is of great interest to New-Church people in all parts of the world. Subscription price $1.25 per year, postpaid.

Order from the

Massachusetts New-Church Union

134 Bowdoin St., Boston 9, Mass.

SWEDENBORG'S WRITINGS

STANDARD EDITION, 30 vols., dark green cloth, $30.00, or $1.00 per vol. postpaid.

ROTCH EDITION, 32 vols., blue linen buckram, gilt top, $40.00; brown half morocco, full gilt, $125.00; sold only in sets, transportation at cost of purchaser. Separate titles of the Rotch Edition at special prices as shown in booklist sent upon request.

Also **LATIN** and **LATIN-ENGLISH EDITIONS.**

Send for catalogue containing complete lists.

SUBSCRIBE NOW FOR THE SWEDENBORG STUDENT

The Swedenborg Student is a monthly magazine, edited by Rev. Arthur Wilde, to help in the study of the Writings. It contains also the monthly Bulletin of the Arcana Reading Class.

Subscription price $1.00 per year.

To encourage new members to join the Reading Classes, the Swedenborg Student for one year and the first volume of the "Arcana Cœlestia," Standard Edition, are offered together for $1.50.

SWEDENBORG FOUNDATION

Incorporated

18 East 41st Street **New York, N. Y.**

THE ROTCH TRUST FUND

Mrs. Lydia S. Rotch died in Boston, July 20, 1863, at the age of 80 years. She left $15,000 to be administered by three trustees for the benefit of the Convention. The activity of this Fund, administered by its successive three trustees, has been primarily that of the publication of Swedenborg's Theological Writings, commentaries compiled therefrom, and other works, as follows:

A complete edition of the Theological Works published by Swedenborg.

"The Worship and Love of God."

Commentaries on Matthew, John, Ezekiel and the Psalms.

Selections from Swedenborg, in raised type for the blind.

"Swedenborg, Harbinger of the New Age of the Christian Church," by Benjamin Worcester.

All of these publications are available through the several New-Church book-rooms, to wit:

UNITED STATES.

Akron, Ohio. New-Church Book Room 369 So. Maple St., Room 6.
Baltimore, Md. Swedenborg Book Center, 3812 Barrington Road.
Boston, Mass. Massachusetts New-Church Union, 134 Bowdoin St.
Chicago, Ill. Western New-Church Union, Rooms 1745-6. 17 N. State St.
Cincinnati, Ohio. New-Church Library, Oak Street and Winslow Avenue.
Los Angeles, Calif. New-Church Book Room, 509 So. Westmoreland Ave.
New York, N. Y. Swedenborg Foundation, Inc., 18 E. 41 St., Manhattan.
New-Church Press, 108 Clark St., Brooklyn Heights.
Philadelphia, Pa. New-Church Book Association, 2129 Chestnut St.
San Francisco, Calif. New-Church Library, 1640 O'Farrell St.
St. Louis, Mo. New-Church Book Room, 1215 Sunset Ave.
Washington, D. C. New-Church Library, 16th and Corcoran Street, N.W.
Wilmington, Del. New-Church Book Room, Penn Ave. and Broome St.

CANADA.

Toronto, Ont. Wm. H. Law, 561 Yonge St.

ENGLAND.

London. The Swedenborg Society, and The New-Church Press, Ltd., 20 Hart St., Bloomsbury, W. C. 1.
Manchester. New-Church Book Depot, 34 John Dalton St.
Glasgow, Scotland. Scottish New-Church Library, 229 Woodland Road.

AUSTRALIA.

Brisbane, Queensland. 345 Ann St., near Wharf St.

INDIA.

Bombay. Swedenborg Society of India, A. E. Penn, Sec., 23 Sussex Road, Bombay.

SWITZERLAND.

Geneva. Agence des Publications de la Nouvelle Eglise, 22 Rue de la Confederation.

The Fund assists, from time to time, in other New-Church uses to the extent that it has available funds; for example, the Neighborhood House at Lynn, Mass., to the support of which it regularly contributes. It has also coöperated in the publication of some of Swedenborg's scientific works, and of the photofacsimile reproductions of Swedenborg's theological manuscripts.

The original sum is intact, and the income only is used. This is, of course, entirely inadequate to help all the uses which come before the Rotch Trustees for contributions, including many for which other New-Church funds are not available because of their limitations. It is estimated that since the death of Mrs. Rotch, the trustees have spent over $65,000.00 in various church uses.

Will friends of the New Church continually bear in mind the importance of increasing the Rotch Trust Fund, whether by "giving while living" or by will?

The present Trustees are:

GEORGE C. WARREN, *President*,
CHARLES N. MASON,
JOHN W. HATHAWAY, *Secretary and Treasurer*,
18 Tremont St., Boston, Mass.